21827

National Library of Canada / Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

CANADIAN THESES ON MICROFICHE / THÈSES CANADIENNES SUR MICROFICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR/NOM DE L'AUTEUR PETER PHILIP GRIMMETT

TITLE OF THESIS/TITRE DE LA THÈSE A NEW LOOK AT DIDO: THE FORGOTTEN PLAY OF J.E. SCHLEGEL

UNIVERSITY/UNIVERSITÉ ALBERTA

DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS PRESENTED/GRADE POUR LEQUEL CETTE THÈSE FUT PRÉSENTÉE M.A.

YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED/ANNÉE D'OBTENTION DE CE DEGRÉ 1974

NAME OF SUPERVISOR/NOM DU DIRECTEUR DE THÈSE DR. A. SCOTT

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈQUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prêter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur.

DATED/DATÉ 1st October 1974 SIGNED/SIGNÉ P.P. Grimmett

PERMANENT ADDRESS/RÉSIDENCE FIXE 1308 GALBRAITH HOUSE / MICHENER PARK / EDMONTON, ALTA. / CANADA.

172, COLMAN AVENUE / WEDNESFIELD, WOLVERHAMPTON / ENGLAND.

NL-91 (11-73)

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

A NEW LOOK AT DIDO: THE FORGOTTEN PLAY OF J.E. SCHLEGEL

by

© PETER PHILIP GRIMMETT

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF GERMANIC LANGUAGES

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL, 1974

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled A NEW LOOK AT DIDO: THE FORGOTTEN PLAY OF J.E. SCHLEGEL submitted by Peter Philip Grimmett in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

Alison Scott

Supervisor

Halger Pausch

E. D. Blodgett

20th August, 1974

ABSTRACT

On reading the commentaries of eighteenth century German literature, one has the distinct sense that Schlegel the tragedian, and more particularly, his drama Dido, has been forgotten; many critics see value and significance in Schlegel's dramatic theory but neglect to assess his practice; others see value in only certain tragedies of Schlegel. Even those who devote specific attention to Dido either interpret the play in terms of Gottschedian theory or fail to give a theoretical framework to the play. Nowhere does any critic relate Dido to Schlegel's theory of imitation and his intention to introduce strongly drawn characters, particularly through the portrayal of passion in a noble heroine.

This study is therefore a new look at Dido, the forgotten play of Schlegel. It looks first at Schlegel's dramatic theory, emphasising the aspects of it which are different from Gottschedian theory and stressing its significance to the German theatre of the eighteenth century. Schlegel's theory of imitation and his intention to introduce strongly drawn characters are drawn together in an examination of his tragedy Dido, where the dramatist concentrates on the portrayal of passion in a noble queen. Most of this examination revolves around the characterization of the tragic heroine per se; her relationships to her subjects, to Hiarbas, to Aeneas, and to herself as seen in her speeches, and her eventual disintegration as a person and consequent suicide are analysed in a detailed manner. In her relationship to her subjects, we see Dido's love and concern for them and their admiration for her; Hiarbas shows us the attraction that the noble character of Dido holds for him, but the

Queen of Carthage rebuffs him with pride and disdain; as we examine her relationship to Aeneas we begin to see Dido's love and passion slowly but surely changing to hatred and resentment as her suspicions about her lover are first aroused and then confirmed; finally, we see the effect of this development on the mind of the heroine - disintegration as a person and the consequent suicide.

This in-depth analysis of Schlegel's characterization of the tragic heroine evidences aspects of the dramatist's theory and practice where he was quite ahead of his time for the Rationalist Age. Through his portrayal of Dido's sense and passions as free from intellectual and rational control, thereby denying the efficacy of mere rational understanding as the solution to interpersonal problems, Schlegel influences Lessing and anticipates the philosophy of Hamann, Herder and the Storm and Stress writers. Indeed, his depiction of passion is such that it anticipates the modern theme of alienation. Further, Schlegel evidences in Dido the distinctive attribute of modern tragedy from Shakespeare onwards: that the tragic hero or heroine possesses a character flaw which eventually leads to the catastrophe. In the final analysis, however, this study is an attempt to appreciate fully Schlegel as the tragedian who wrote Dido, a position which literary critics, to the privation of all concerned, have ignored in the past.

/ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

: to Dr. Alison Scott, my supervisor, whose contribution to this thesis went far beyond the normal bounds of thoughtful suggestions and helpful advice to include a re-scheduling of part of her journeyings whilst on sabbatical leave, in order to extend help and encouragement to one of her remoter tutees, struggling with the burdensome task of completing a thesis whilst teaching full-time.

: to Dr. Gerwin Marahrens, Chairman of the Department of Germanic Languages, whose patient forbearance, together with sporadic, strong-worded hints, always kept open the opportunity for the finishing of this thesis.

: to Mrs. Rosemarie Jeske, whose proficiency and competence at the typewriter made the aura of final deadlines seem harmless.

: and to my wife, Maureen, without whose support, encouragement and love, this thesis would never have been re-started, let alone brought to completion, and who, in the final analysis, instilled in me the ambition and drive to fulfil the task I had commenced some five years previously.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter		Page
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	LITERATURE REVIEW	18
III.	THE PLOT OF DIDO	26
IV.	SCHLEGEL'S CHARACTERIZATION OF THE TRAGIC HEROINE	36
	1. Dido's relationship to her subjects	38
	2. Dido's relationship to Hiarbas	43
	3. Dido's relationship to Aeneas	50
	4. Dido's disintegration: her speeches and use of language	71
	5. Dido's suicide	92
V.	CONCLUSION	108
BIBLIOGRAPHY		117
	1. Schlegel's Works	117
	2. Further Original Sources	117
	3. General Critical Sources	118
	4. Critical Sources for Schlegel's Theory and Practice	118

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Towards the end of 1706 Christian Wolff was appointed Professor of Mathematics at the University of Halle. This was one of the most significant events at the beginning of the eighteenth century for he, more than anyone, stimulated philosophical thought in Germany. He did not possess outstanding originality; nevertheless, because of his meticulous exposition and presentation of the philosophical ideas of his predecessors, his contribution to German intellectual life cannot be overestimated. Wolff delved into metaphysics, attempting to explain everything logically and rationally. His ultimate aim had been essentially religious; he intended to bring out a rational theology that contained no contradictions. However, he inevitably came into conflict with the more conservative supporters of orthodox theology, and his contributions influenced the more philosophically-minded rather than the ecclesiastical. Gottsched derived his rationalistic outlook on life from Wolff; he was an avid adherent of his philosophy and demanded that man should always seek to make order from chaos.

In 1719 Wolff produced his work Vernünfftige Gedancken von Gott, der Welt und der Seele des Menschen, auch allen Dingen überhaupt. In this he incorporated many of the ideas that Descartes had used in his Les Passions de l'âme and that Spinoza had mentioned in the third part of his Ethic.[1] It was an attempt on Wolff's part to find a rational

---

[1] Wolff, Christian, Vernünfftige Gedancken von Gott, der Welt und der Seele des Menschen, auch allen Dingen überhaupt. Andrer Teil, 3rd ed. (Frankfurt a.M., 1733), p. 233ff.

explanation for God, the world and the various passions that are contained within the human soul. Gottsched, as self-appointed dictator of taste and intellectual life, took this philosophical approach over into the field of art. For Gottsched, Wolff's definition of philosophy - "das gründliche Erkenntnis aller Dinge"[2] - was also true for drama. Only through rational thought could art be properly evaluated and art itself must be based on the natural and the rational.

When he wrote his Versuch einer critischen Dichtkunst in 1730, Gottsched made a conscious attempt to define how dramatic art could be natural and rational. Using the Greek poets and Aristotle as his examples, he argues that all art should, in essence, be "eine Nachahmung der Natur."[3] However, Gottsched did not see this as anything more than a mere depiction of the potentially real: "Die Wahrscheinlichkeit ist die Haupteigenschaft aller Fabeln; und wenn eine Fabel nicht wahrscheinlich ist, so taugt sie nichts."[4] He explains further what he means by poetic probability:

> Ich verstehe nämlich durch die poetische Wahrscheinlichkeit nichts anders als die Ähnlichkeit des Erdichteten mit dem, was wirklich zu geschehen pflegt, oder die Übereinstimmung der Fabel mit der Natur.[5]

One might conclude from such a theory that it would produce a realistic kind of drama, this is, however, not so. Gottsched realises this danger:

> Allein zu neuern Zeiten heißt es gewiß, etwas ersinnen, oder erfinden, was nicht wirklich geschehen ist. Sachen nämlich, die wirklich geschehen

---

[2] Gottsched, Johann Cristoph, Versuch einer critischen Dichtkunst, 4th ed. (Leipzig, 1744), p. 96.

[3] Ibid., p. 92.

[4] Ibid. Gottsched is here using "Fabel" in the same context as "Handlung."

[5] Ibid., p. 198.

sind, d.i., wahre Begebenheiten, darf man nicht erst dichten: folglich entsteht aus der Beschreibung und Erzählung derselben kein Gedicht, sondern eine Historie, oder Geschichte; und ihr Verfasser bekommt nicht den Namen eines Dichters, sondern eines Geschichtsschreibers.[6]

In this sense, Gottsched did not differ materially from Lessing, or Schiller. However, for the French dramatists, whom Gottsched revered so much, the theory of imitation did not so much mean an observation of reality as the personification of an idea. Their literal interpretation of Aristotle's demand that all characters be consistent[7] made this idea into an invariable rule. For the French classicists therefore, this meant that no character could undergo any change within the confining time limit; hence the increasing moral rigidity of the hero and the predictable outcome of the spiritual conflict.

The influence that French and Greek dramatists exerted upon Gottsched prevented his theory of imitation from producing a naturalistic effect;[8] his conception of nature was indeed very different from that of Hauptmann or Ibsen:

Die Schönheit eines künstlichen Werkes beruht nicht auf einem leeren Dünkel, sondern sie hat ihren festen und notwendigen Grund in der Natur der Dinge. Gott hat alles nach Zahl, Maaß und Gewicht geschaffen. Die

---

[6] Ibid., p. 149. cf. Aristotle, who was quite clear about the function of the dramatist in this respect: "It is, moreover, evident from what has been said, that it is not the function of the poet to relate what has happened but what may happen, what is possible according to the law of probability or necessity." Aristotle's Poetics, transl. by S.H. Butcher, 4th Ed. (New York, 1951), IX, 35.

[7] Ibid., XV, 55.

[8] see Wilkinson, Elizabeth, Johann Elias Schlegel as a German Pioneer in Aesthetics (Darmstadt, 1973), p. 38-39.

natürlichen Dinge sind an sich selber schön: und wenn also die Kunst auch was schönes hervorbringen will, so muß sie dem Muster der Natur nachahmen. Das genaue Verhältnis, die Ordnung und das richtige Ebenmaaß aller Theile, daraus ein Ding besteht, ist die Quelle aller Schönheit. Die Nachahmung der vollkommenen Natur kann also einem künstlichen Werke die Vollkommenheit geben, dadurch es dem Verstande gefällig und angenehm wird: und die Abweichung von ihrem Muster wird allemal etwas ungestaltes und abgeschmacktes zuwege bringen.[9]

It is with this in mind that Gottsched maintains that tragedy "ist nur geschickt, Schrecken und Mitleid zu erwecken, und also die Gemüthsbewegungen der Zuschauer, auf eine der Tugend gemäße Weise zu erregen."[10] On the other hand the dramatist uses tragedy as a medium to teach truths, "und die Zuschauer, durch den Anblick solcher schweren Fälle der Grossen dieser Welt, zu ihren eigenen Trübsalen vorbereiten."[11] This idea, that the aim of all art and creative writing is to enlighten and to educate, did not, however, originate with Gottsched but with Horace: "Aut prodesse volunt aut delectare poetae."[12]

Gottsched's significance during the first half of the eighteenth century lay in his purification of the German theatre, ridding it of the surviving traditions of Baroque drama with its stereotyped plots and characterizations.[13] It was Gottsched's reform of the theatre and

---

[9]Gottsched, op. cit., p. 132.

[10]Ibid., p. 612.

[11]Ibid., p. 606.

[12]Horace, Ars Poetica, V, p. 333.

[13]Gottsched did produce dramas, including two tragedies with heroines as protagonists - Iphigenie, Thalestris and Königin der Amazonen - but these were more copies than original contributions on Gottsched's part. Indeed, only Der sterbende Cato purports to being original and much of that was copied from Addison, Gottsched's source! As such, therefore, Gottsched's dramas have little literary significance - his heroines are static, hardly life-like, and the plays contain little or no dramatic action.

his tragic theory that was important, for this not only stimulated a renewed interest in the German stage but also opened the way for a more gifted dramatist like Schlegel to continue the process he had started. He too was an imitator of nature but in a dramatically more satisfying way than Gottsched. In his plays it is possible to see the gradual emergence of tragic pathos as a potent force in producing dramatic effect. As was to become more popular as the eighteenth century wore on, he heightened the pathos by the portrayal of a passionate tragic heroine. This he was able to do because the tragic heroine, by virtue of her relative insignificance prior to the eighteenth century, was not as stereotyped as her male counterpart in German drama and the dramatist had, therefore, a freer hand in his characterization.

Gottsched had ostensibly advocated an exact imitation of reality and never qualified this at all. But by choosing as his model a highly stylized drama, and by acclaiming the authority of rules and traditional conventions without ever attempting to reconcile these with his principle of strict imitation, he did, in fact, provide a loop-hole, as it were. Moreover, by restricting the kind of reality that may be imitated to "die schöne Natur," Gottsched retreated still further from a position of realism. Nowhere in the formulation of his theory, however, is there any modification of the principle, and wherever it was easy of application, he hastened to stress it.[14] Schlegel, like Gottsched, was an imitator of nature. Yet, although he agreed with the basic principle behind Gottsched's theory, he was not content to leave unaccounted for the many differences between art and reality - differences

---

[14]Wilkinson, E., op. cit., p. 54.

of both quality and quantity. Because he knew of these differences from his own experience, he refused to pass over them tacitly in his theory. Consequently, he proposed to focus his attention on the law of imitation in order to understand it fully:

> Eine genauere Untersuchung des Begriffs von der Nachahmung habe ich seit langer Zeit für eine Sache gehalten, welche unentbehrlich ist, wenn man in der Dichtkunst mehr mit Gründen behaupten als nach eigenem Gutdünken und nach einem geübten Gefühle entscheiden will. Man kann nicht eher überzeugend wissen, ob man etwas mit Recht natürlich oder unnatürlich nenne; ja mich dünket, man kann die Grenzen der Wahrscheinlichkeit nicht eher gewiss bestimmen, als bis man erst diesen Begriff auf das genaueste bestimmet hat.[15]

Unlike Gottsched, Schlegel was convinced that the difference between art and reality does not lie in the choice of subject. Further, he recognises that the special kind of pleasure aroused by art is not dependent on the subject chosen.[16] Even ugliness can be a subject for art: "so kann man sie nicht hinweglassen, ohne den Menschen die lebhaftesten Vorstellungen zu rauben."[17] Whether such an object becomes a work of art, whether it finally gives pleasure, depends on the treatment. And it is herein, in treatment and not in choice of subject, that Schlegel seeks the solution of his problem.[18]

He was not, however, content with mere empirical observations; rather he felt the need to account for his views philosophically, particularly for the differences within a general similarity. This he achieved by making a carefully drawn distinction between similarity and complete identity. The latter, Gottsched's recommendation, would be

---

[15]Schlegel, Johann Elias, "Abhandlung von der Nachahmung," Werke, hrsg. von J.H. Schlegel, 5 Bde. (Kopenhagen, Leipzig, 1761), III, p. 107.

[16]Ibid., p. 128.

[17]"Von der Unähnlichkeit," Werke, III, pp. 169, 174.

[18]Wilkinson, op. cit.

obtained by imitating any object of reality in respect of all its qualities. Similarity, however, can be obtained by imitating in respect of one quality alone:

> Wenn man einen Kopf in Stein hauet, so ahmet man weder seine harten noch weichen Theile, noch seine Farbe nach, sonder bloss die Figur desselben. Eben daher kommt es, daß auch in der Dichtkunst, Beschreibungen einer einzigen Sache ganz verschieden, und dennoch vollständig seyn können; weil nämlich ein jeder die Theile derselben in Absicht auf eine andre Beschaffenheit betrachtet.[19]

Clearly, the artist cannot imitate reality any more closely than his medium (in Schlegel's case, drama) will allow. Through the medium or material that he uses, the artist tries to reproduce some aspect of reality. Verse is a medium which the dramatic poet may choose if he wish. The argument that people do not in reality speak in rhyme or in verse, and should therefore not do so in drama, is no more valid than the claim that, because people in reality have colouring, they should not therefore be without it when portrayed in sculpture. In Schlegel's view, the medium that the artist is working with will dictate the divergence to reality found in the work of art.[20]

After careful consideration of what the concept "Nachahmung der Natur" actually means, Schlegel comes to the conclusion that the rightful claim to creative art of all imitation was to be found in the differences between it and reality. If the imitation is a mere copy, then it will fail to bring aesthetic satisfaction to the spectator. That is not to say that Schlegel always stresses the difference between art and reality; on the contrary, the basis of art for him is the imitation of nature; he modifies the scope of it but never

---

[19] "Von der Nachahmung," Werke, III, p. 115.

[20] cf. Wilkinson, E., op. cit., p. 56.

rejects the principle. Confusion on the part of the reader must be avoided; the imitation must convey "die deutlichsten Begriffe von dem Vorbilde."[21] But by vindicating the artist's freedom to choose, not only his subject and medium, but also the degree of similarity with the natural object, Schlegel releases him from the obligation to imitate reality as closely as possible:

> Also ist es auch willkürlich, den Grad so wohl, als das Subject der Nachahmung und das Vorbild selbsten zu wählen....Man soll, nämlich, zuweilen die Nachahmung der Sache, der man nachahmet, unähnlich machen.[22]

The tendency of art is away from nature as well as towards it. Its aim, for Schlegel, is the communication of pleasure rather than similarity to nature. His demand for some dissimilarity between the imitation and the natural object is not meant to encourage a lack of order in art but rather serves to increase the effect of the imitation:

> Bey dem Vergnügen, das aus der Nachahmung entstehen soll, wird notwendig vorausgesetzt, daß in der Einbildungskraft dererjenigen, bey denen die Nachahmung einen Eindruck machen soll, das Bild und Vorbild gegeneinander gehalten werde. Folglich werden in dieser Einbildungskraft zwei Vorstellungen erfordert, nämlich eine von dem Vorbilde und die andere von dem Bilde; und die ganze Wirkung der Nachahmung fällt hinweg, sobald Eine von diesen Vorstellungen mangelt.[23]

Schlegel therefore argues that the principle of aesthetic pleasure depends on the spectator's being aware of the comparison between the imitation and the object, i.e., the imitation is ineffective if the spectator can establish no connection whatsoever between the two. For Schlegel, the imitation must be connected with the natural object, yet at the same time not be an identical copy. Like Gottsched, Schlegel

---

[21] Werke, III, p. 126.

[22] Ibid., pp. 124, 168.

[23] Ibid., p. 149.

did not doubt the validity of imitation in creative art; it was, however, his demand for emphasis on some aspects in the imitation that precipitated the fundamental difference of interpretation that existed between Gottsched and himself.

> Eine solche Schilderung [Nachahmung] sondert eine Sache von dem Nebenumständen ab, mit denen das Original vermischt ist. Die Natur zeigt uns den Heuchler, den Eifersüchtigen, den Spieler, den Menschenfeind nicht in demselben Lichte wie das Theater. Denn auf diesem ist ihr Charakter ganz einfach, ohne Vermischung anderer Tugenden und Laster. In der Natur ist er allemal mit vielen andern Dingen vermengt; und ihn unter den fremden Umständen herauszusuchen, kostet hier allemal erst dasjenige Nachdenken, welches in einem Schauspiele der Verfasser schon für uns übernommen hat.[24]

Whenever Schlegel wrote about art, it was always with drama uppermost in his mind. This form of art is most suited for his imitation theory, first because of its obvious link with reality, and secondly because of those obvious departures from reality which are the source of its special power.[25] For if the spectator is made aware of the succeeding motives for each action in a way that is rarely possible in real life, then the dramatic imitation will seem more convincing to him than any mere identical reproduction of reality. Indeed, the dramatic imitation could even be more convincing than life itself! Schlegel believes that the spectator will be convinced by a strict adherence to dramatic probability, but clearly not of an external kind. What he demands is probability within the dramatic form, causal probability of the strictest kind: "Eine Begebenheit ist alsdann wahrscheinlich, wenn sie ihre zureichende Ursache hat."[26] Nowhere does the fundamental difference of interpretation

---

[24]"Gedanken zur Aufnahme des dänischen Theaters," Werke, III, p. 272.

[25]Wilkinson, E., op. cit., p. 80.

[26]"Gedanken," Werke, III, p. 282.

between Schlegel and Gottsched appear more marked than in the question of probability. While for Gottsched it is a mechanical rule which he applies to the forms of the drama, for Schlegel it is a test of the inner necessity of the dramatic action. The result is that Gottsched often attacks dramatic conventions, but remains the slave of traditional rules, while Schlegel accepts the conventions, but has a freer attitude towards tradition and rules.[27] For Schlegel, therefore, the unities are not aids to naturalism. They are conventions of form accepted for the sake of the effect they produce. By confining time and space to these narrowest limits, the dramatist prevents dispersal of interest, precludes much action of an external kind, and focuses attention on the characters, and on every change in their emotions and will: "Wenn die Einheit des Ortes und der Zeit beobachtet ist, kann der Zuschauer seine ganze Aufmerksamkeit auf die Handlung, auf die Charaktere, und auf die Leidenschaften verwenden."[28]

However, because he agreed in principle with Gottsched's theory of imitation, Schlegel has often had the misfortune to be viewed merely as a pupil of Gottsched's. Much of this stems from the fact that most of his contemporaries were not familiar with his more specific dramatic theories, since they were largely published posthumously. Whatever the reason for this viewpoint, if we accept it without question today, we do Schlegel an immense injustice. Wilkinson's comparison of their writings shows just how much the genius of Schlegel has been understated:

> To turn from the Critische Dichtkunst...to the writings of Johann Elias Schlegel, is to turn from belittling criticism to living appreciation. Here is none of that cold reserve which is engendered by timid

---

[27] Wilkinson, op. cit., p. 81.

[28] Werke, III, p. 294.

dependence on rules, and issues in pettifogging attention to detail, but an openness of interest which can see greatness even in unaccustomed guise.[29]

Moreover, Schlegel was an accomplished tragedian in his own right. J.W. Eaton rightly makes the point that his contemporaries "acknowledged him as a master of the tragic style and they saw that his use of German material in tragedy....meant an important step forward for the German stage."[30] C.H. Schmid maintained that Schlegel greatly improved the poor German tragedy that he found under Gottsched by the introduction of strongly drawn characters; these were more natural and captivating.

Er gab der Handlung einen natürlichen fortschreitenden Gang, und einzelne interessante Situationen, er behauptete seine Charaktere, und zeichnete sie durch einzelne starke Züge aus.[31]

J.J. Eschenburg saw Schlegel's dramatic works as superior to those of his predecessors and contemporaries and regarded him as the creator of a better literary taste in both comedy and tragedy:

Die dramatischen Arbeiten dieses allzu jung verstorbenen, und immer noch sehr schätzenswürdigen Dichters unterscheiden sich von allen ähnlichen Werken seiner Vorgänger und Zeitgenossen so sehr, daß man ihn als Schöpfer des bessern deutschen Geschmacks sowohl in der komischen als tragischen Gattung anzusehen hat.[32]

Schlegel was, indeed, influenced by Gottsched's ideas; he did, however, possess a creative genius of his own. Christian Fürchtegott Gellert, his contemporary, dismissed the idea that Gottsched alone was responsible

---

[29]Wilkinson, op. cit., p. 94.

[30]J.W. Eaton, "Johann Elias Schlegel and German Literature," Germanic Review 4 (1929), pp. 327-351:p. 328.

[31]C.H. Schmid, Nekrolog der vornehmsten teutschen Dichter (Erfurt, 1785), p. 263.

[32]J.J. Eschenburg, Beispielsammlung der schönen Wissenschaften (Berlin, 1793), p. 328

for Schlegel's dramatic theory and practice: "Ich weiß Niemanden, der diesen Mann gebildet hätte; sein eignes Genie und Lesen that es."[33] Gottsched himself, who, rightly or wrongly, regarded Schlegel as his pupil, favoured his Dido over his Hermann - a fact that is all the more astounding when one realises that, of the two plays, only Hermann was written when Schlegel was directly under the influence of Gottsched.

It is on this basis that Eaton postulates that Schlegel was more a successor of Opitz than Gottsched, for his knowledge of the classical sources was far more profound than Gottsched's.[34] Franz Joseph Schneider, on the other hand, is quite definite in his opinion that, in his creative thinking, Schlegel followed the example of the Swiss. "Schlegel ist als Denker nicht wie als Dichter von Gottsched sondern von den Schweizern ausgegangen."[35] Schlegel did not set out, as Gottsched had done, to give a collection of dramatic precepts but attempted to discover the nature and essence of poetry. Gottsched closed the old period, Schlegel began the new. Alongside Gottsched's moral interest in art comes Schlegel's independent aesthetic interest. Not only must one please and instruct, but the writer who pleases and does not instruct is, for Schlegel, a greater writer than one who instructs but does not give pleasure. "So mögen die strengen Sittendichter sauer sehen wie sie wollen, ich muß gestehen: daß das Vergnügen dem Unterrichten vorgehe."[36]

In his essays on dramatic theory, Schlegel is a precursor of Lessing, a fact readily acknowledged by the writer of the Hamburg

---

[33]Gellert, Christian Fürchtegott, Sämtliche Schriften (Berlin, 1776), X, p. 39.

[34]Eaton, op. cit., p. 335.

[35]Schneider, Franz Joseph, Die deutsche Dichtung zwischen Barock und Klassizismus 1700-1785 (Stuttgart, 1924), p. 99.

[36]Schlegel, Werke, III, p. 136.

Dramaturgy himself.[37] Indeed, Charlotte von Wymetal makes the claim that, had he not died so young, Schlegel would probably have furthered the development of heroic tragedy to the point of depriving Lessing's theory of its revolutionary character.[38] The essence of his dramatic theory (and this is where he differed most from Gottsched) was that Schlegel did not see the theatre primarily as a medium for moral education; on the other hand, however, he did not fail to recognise its ethical aspect, as the representative of national culture and good taste:

> Obgleich das Vergnügen der Hauptzweck des Theaters ist, so ist es doch nicht der einzige Zweck desselben... Lehren ist ohne Zweifel eine viel wichtigere Sache als Ergetzen. Gleichwohl ist das Theater, das seinem Wesen nach bloß zum Ergetzen gemacht ist, zum Lehren sehr geschickt.[39]

Later in the same treatise, Schlegel explains what the aim of the theatre should be - to please in a way that can also educate:

> In der That hat das Theater nicht nötig, eine andere Absicht vorzugeben, als die edle Absicht, den Verstand des Menschen auf eine vernünftige Art zu ergetzen. Wenn es lehrt, so thut es solches nicht wie ein Pedant, welcher es allemal voraus verkündigt, daß er etwas Kluges sagen will, sondern wie ein Mensch, der durch seinen Umgang unterrichtet, und der sich hütet, jemals zu erkennen zu geben, daß dieses seine Absicht sei. Es ist genug, wenn der Poet weis, daß er in seinem Werke Gelegenheit hat, der Sittenlehre Dienste zu thun. Und der dramatische Poet hat diese Gelegenheit besonders durch eine genaue und feine Abschilderung der Gemüther und Leidenschaften.[40]

Schlegel therefore advocates education through pleasure, whereas the more austere Gottsched believed that pleasure should only be derived through

---

[37] Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim, "Hamburgische Dramaturgie - Ankündigung," Sämtliche Schriften L - M (Stuttgart, 1893), IX, p. 181.

[38] Wymetal, Charlotte von, "The hero and his opponent in the heroic tragedy from Gottsched to Lessing," Unpublished Diss. (New Haven, 1954), p. 120.

[39] Schlegel, Werke, III, pp. 270-271.

[40] Ibid., pp. 271-272

education. Schlegel saw the theatre as educating in far broader terms than merely illustrating specific moral points. The presentation of characters with all their problems and emotions leaves the spectator with an impression that is far more effective and worthwhile as a means of education than a depiction of a character that is free of any complications. Indeed, the spectator derives greater social and intellectual benefit from witnessing the depiction of life rather than one isolated example of morality.

The tendency towards moral education in the theatre was one of the major shortcomings of the whole Rationalist period. From Gottsched to Lessing the whole of creative art was prone to exist merely within the realm of the intellect. This is indicative of how far-reaching Gottsched's influence was in the field of drama. Schlegel, however, resisted this trend. His Gedanken zur Aufnahme des dänischen Theaters, written in Denmark in 1747, also applied to the needs of the German theatre. This treatise not only heralded a new literary epoch; Hermann Hettner strongly contends that it was a declaration of war on Gottsched and the French school:

> Diese Schrift ist unstreitig das Beste, was vor Lessing jemals von einem Deutschen über dramatische Dinge geschrieben wurde. Sie ist eine sehr entschiedene und unumwundene Kriegserklärung gegen Gottsched und die französische Tragik.[41]

Christian Felix Weisse paid tribute to Schlegel, his contemporary. It was because of him that a Cato would no longer be possible on the German stage, although at one time it had been well received.

---

[41] Hettner, Hermann, Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im 18. Jahrhundert (Braunschweig, 1925), III, 1, p. 319.

Man würde sich itzt schämen, einen Cato oder Allemannische Brüder auf unserem Theater aufzuführen; da es eine Zeit gab, wo man sie mit Beifall sah...so hat sich doch unser Geschmack ungemein verfeinert; und wir würden undankbar sein, wenn wir nicht einen großen Theil dieses Verdienstes dem unsterblichen Bruder unseres Herausgebers zuschreiben.[42]

Schlegel differs from Gottsched in one more important way; he was not only a German pioneer in aesthetics,[43] but also a pioneer in the study of Shakespeare that was later to prove so important in the development of German drama:

Der einzige, der in all diesen Jahren, während seines kurzen, aber von großen Entwürfen erfüllten Lebens, vielleicht leise geahnt hat, was Englands größter Tragiker für die deutsche Dichtung einst bedeuten könne, ist Johann Elias Schlegel gewesen.[44]

A long time before Lessing had the tenacity to say so, Schlegel maintained that the English dramatists had far excelled the French in their application of classical rules. Schlegel did not disagree with the classical unities; he merely felt that the French dramatists had applied them too rigidly and had therefore failed to understand their deeper significance.

Sie (die Regeln) sind aber von ihren Nachfolgern übel verstanden worden. Denn schon oft hat man das Wesen des Schauspiels daraus gemacht, und geglaubt, daß man ein schönes Stück verfertigt habe, wenn man nur diese Regeln wohl in Acht genommen, ob man gleich die Schönheit der Handlung und der Charaktere gänzlich aus den Augen gesetzt hatte....Die Wahrheit zu gestehen, beobachten die Engländer, die sich keiner Einheit des Ortes rühmen, dieselbe grossentheils viel besser, als die Franzosen, die sich damit viel wissen, daß sie die Regeln des Aristoteles so genau beobachten.[45]

---

[42]Weisse, Christian Felix, Neue Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften (1770), I, p. 37. It was also because of Gottsched's dispute with the Neuber Troupe, who had parodied the protagonist of his Cato by dressing him in pink tights, that a Cato never again appeared on the German stage.

[43]Wilkinson, op. cit., p.99.

[44]Köster, Albert, Die Literatur der Aufklärungszeit (Heidelberg, 1925), p. 83.

[45]Schlegel, Werke, III, pp. 292, 294.

In his treatise Vergleichung Shakespeares und Andreas Gryps. Schlegel was the first to give a less enthusiastic estimate of the French classical tragedy that Gottsched valued so highly; in its place, he recommends Sophocles and the English dramatists as better examples to follow. Eugen Wolff comments on the significance of this:

> Ist es Gottscheds großer Verdienst, den Gedanken der deutschen Literatur als einer historisch zusammenhängender Einheit zuerst ausgesprochen zu haben, so ist es Elias Schlegels größerer Verdienst, auf den verschiedensten Gebieten die ersten Anläufe zur Erfüllung dieser einheitlichen Literatur mit einem ihr charakteristischen Wesen, d.h., zur positiven Befreiung derselben von fremden Joche unternommen zu haben.[46]

Through his critical appraisal of the French dramatists, Schlegel had taken the first step towards breaking the powerful hold that French taste had over the German theatre. The significant finding of his comparison of Shakespeare and Gryphius was that Shakespeare attached a great deal of importance to the careful presentation of characters and their passions. As a consequence, Schlegel's dramatic theory developed along different lines; character rather than plot became the focal-point of his tragedy, i.e., the spiritual involvements of the inner conflict, not the intricate circumstances of a given situation, form the core of the dramatic action.

> Ein Stück ohne Charaktere ist ein Stück ohne alle Wahrscheinlichkeit, weil die Ursache, warum ein Mensch so oder so handelt, eben in seinem Charakter liegt. Wo demnach dieser nicht festgesetzt ist, geschehen die Handlungen ohne Ursache, und sind also nicht wahrscheinlich.[47]

In reality this meant that, for Schlegel, passion and its portrayal in a "Charakterstück" had now started to play a prominent role in his

---

[46] Wolff, Eugen, Johann Elias Schlegel, eine Monographie (Berlin, 1889), p. 92f.

[47] Schlegel, Werke, III, p. 284.

dramatic practice; it was to become particularly significant in the portrayal of the tragic heroine, a development that was to grow in popularity as the eighteenth century wore on. Charlotte von Wymetal sees this introduction of heroic pathos in tragedy as "a distinct sign of progress, for it raises the German theatre to an artistic level which it would not have attained through Gottsched's pedantically one-sided efforts."[48] Schlegel's independence of Gottsched in his dramatic theory and practice is therefore very significant, for it is through this more than anything that pathos began to emerge in tragedy.

---

[48] Wymetal, op. cit., p. 141.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

> Er gab der Handlung einen natürlichen fortschreitenden Gang, und einzelne interessante Situationen, er behauptete seine Characktere, und zeichnete sie durch einzelne starke Züge aus. (Schmid, C.H. Nekrolog der vornehmsten teutschen Dichter Erfurt, 1785, p. 263)

Schmid (1785), one of the earliest critics of Schlegel on record, found that this playwright greatly improved upon the Gottschedian tragedy of the day by introducing an emphasis on strongly drawn characters. Eschenburg (1793), a contemporary of Schmid's, claims that Schlegel's dramatic works were superior to those of his predecessors or contemporaries, and he regarded him as the creator of a better literary taste in German literature.[1] Schlegel's contemporaries recognized him as a master of the tragic style. However, in the nineteenth century, few critics appear to have appreciated Schlegel's value as a tragedian. Danzel (1848)[2] and Waniek (1897)[3] both emphasise Schlegel's depedence upon Gottsched. Waniek makes the case that, but for the ideas of Gottsched and his own reading of Cato, Schlegel would never have been introduced to dramatic production. Danzel (1848) dismisses Schlegel and his total writings as Gottschedian. Danzel comes out firmly that Schlegel was strictly Gottschedian except for his veering towards first ancient Greek and then English drama.[4]

---

[1] Eschenburg, J.J. Beispielsammlung der schönen Wissenschaft (Berlin, 1793).

[2] Danzel, T. Gottsched und seine Zeit (Leipzig, 1840).

[3] Waniek, G. Gottsched und die Literatur seiner Zeit (Leipzig, 1897).

[4] It must be remembered that Danzel was writing before Schlegel's theoretical treatises were published by Antoniewicz in 1887.

Indeed, he maintains that, but for his early death, we would have seen Schlegel's interest in other drama in its true perspective as nothing but a temporary diversion from the Gottschedian philosophy that he had adopted.

Antoniewicz (1887) attempted to demonstrate how Schlegel was, in his theoretical and aesthetical treatises, an important forerunner of Lessing and the Storm and Stress dramatists.[5] Eugen Wolff (1889) further contributed to the attempt to appreciate Schlegel as a tragedian.[6] Indeed, this critic gives us, in his monograph, the first mention of Dido that we have on record; however, he spends most of his section on Schlegel's Dido analysing the plot. He sees the play from the viewpoint that Vergil's Aeneid is the object imitated by Schlegel, claiming that the addition of the Hiarbas episode was a creative innovation on the dramatist's part. Creizenach (1890), whose sole purpose is the criticism of Eugen Wolff's book on Schlegel, throws considerable light on the origin of the Hiarbas episode in Dido.[7] He strongly contends that not only did Schlegel borrow the Hiarbas episode from Le Franc de Pompignan's Didon but that Hiarbas' personal appearance in front of Dido, in the guise of an ambassador, was lifted directly from the same source. Wolff places the emphasis in his book on Schlegel's effectiveness as a theorist and dramatic critic; in spite of this, however, he still sees Schlegel as largely Gottschedian in

---

[5]Antoniewicz, Johann von. "Vorwort," Ästhetische und dramaturgische Schriften (Heilbronn, 1887).

[6]Wolff, Eugen. Johann Elias Schlegel, eine Monographie (Berlin, 1889).

[7]Creizenach, Wilhelm. "Besprechung von Eugen Wolffs Buch über Schlegel," Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 22 (1890).

his philosophy, accepting Danzel's statement that Gottsched, and not Schlegel, was responsible for a national literature in Germany. Rentsch (1890) supports the contention put forward by Wolff that Schlegel created the Hiarbas episode himself.[8] His dissertation fails to bring out the significance of Schlegel as a dramatic theorist and tragedian in his own right.

The nineteenth century had afforded only scant reference to Schlegel's Dido; the contribution of the first quarter of the twentieth century was only somewhat greater. Schum (1919) briefly mentions Dido as an example of a tragedy written in the alexandrine metre, but he is more concerned with the whole of the German alexandrine tragedy than one mere play.[9] Schneider (1924), whilst emphasising the valuable contribution that Schlegel's theoretical writings made to German cultural life, gives Dido cursory treatment; in three lines he dismisses it as a stoic victory for duty over love.[10] Köster (1925) looks at the major tragedies of Schlegel, Canut and Hermann, his comedies and theoretical writings but never once does he refer to Dido.[11] He does, however, stress the significance of the dramatist's search into English drama, away from the sterotyped ideas of Gottsched - it was this that made him the outstanding tragedian of the time. Hettner (1925) classifies Schlegel not as Gottschedian, but as a member of the circle of "Bremer Beiträger" along with Zachariä, Rabener and Gellert.[12] Schlegel was undoubtedly a staunch pupil of Gottsched's; in spite of that, Hettner sees him as quite independent of his teacher

---

[8] Rentsch, J. J.E. Schlegel als Trauerspieldichter. Diss. (Erlangen, 1890).

[9] Schum, A. Studien zur deutschen Alexandrinertragödie (Würzburg, 1919).

[10] Schneider, F.J. Die deutsche Dichtung zwischen Barock und Klassizismus 1700-1785 (Stuttgart, 1924).

[11] Köster, Albert. Die Literatur der Aufklärungszeit (Heidelberg, 1925).

[12] Hettner, Hermann. Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im 18. Jahrhundert (Braunschweig, 1925).

in the dramatic and aesthetic theory that he later produced. Hettner thus concentrates on Schlegel's theoretical writings, discerning in them a significance that distinguished him as a literary figure. His dramas, however, he deals with scantily and apologetically; "seine dichterische Tätigkeit kam nicht zur Reife."[13] Dido, along with the other dramas, does not get a mention. Whilst criticising Schlegel's lack of originality, Hettner praises his attempt at opening up new ways in drama, leading to his eventual success in writing a patriotic play - Hermann.

During the second quarter of the twentieth century, critical knowledge about Dido increased, but the rate of progress was slow. Sperber (1929) is more concerned with the language of the Enlightenment and Dido is only mentioned in passing, as it were.[14] Eaton's article (1929) makes the case that Schlegel's contemporaries recognized him as a master of the tragic style and saw, in his moving away from Gottsched towards a national literature, an important advance for the German theatre.[15] Dido, however, is not mentioned. Bünemann (1928) analyses the plot of Dido but only in so far as it throws light on his comparison of Schlegel with Wieland as imitators of ancient tragedy.[16] Semrau (1930) has as his interest the Dido-theme in the whole of German literature and, as such, his analysis of Schlegel's Dido is only penetrating in so far as the play contributes to the Dido legend as a whole.[17] He is not concerned with

---

[13] Ibid., p.321.

[14] Sperber, H. "Die Sprache der Aufklärung," Zeitschrift für deutschen Unterricht 43, 1929.

[15] Eaton, J.W. "Johann Elias Schlegel and German Literature," Germanic Review 4, 1929.

[16] Bünemann, H. Elias Schlegel und Wieland als Bearbeiter antiker Tragödien (Leipzig, 1928).

[17] Semrau, Eberhard. Dido in der deutschen Dichtung (Berlin und Leipzig, 1930).

Schlegel's theory of imitation, nor with the portrayal of strongly drawn characters by the dramatist; his interest is more in a comparison of Schlegel's play with other versions of the Dido material. Schonder (1941) adopts a similar position to Antoniewicz, emphasising how Schlegel was, in fact, an important forerunner of Lessing and the Storm and Stress dramatists.

Since 1950, there has been comparatively more critical literature published about Schlegel's Dido. Relative to the amount of literature written about Schlegel's other dramatic works, however, reference to Dido in the last two decades can, at best, be only described as scant. Wymetal (1954), in dealing with her theme, views the play as didactic in its essence; she places a good deal of emphasis on the message that stems from the contrast between Aeneas' rational love and Dido's unrestrained passions.[18] Moreover, she betrays a leaning to many of the ideas put forward by Eugen Wolff, particularly concerning the origin of the Hiarbas episode. It favours her thesis to agree with Wolff's contention that Schlegel created the additional Hiarbas plot; for, from there, she enunciates that Schlegel uses this plot in order to portray Dido as the rational and serene queen, dying to save her subjects and her city, maintaining that, to allow her suicide to result from her previous motives of bitterness, vengeance and despair, would have stamped her as an unreasoning woman and as such unfit for the role of the tragic heroine. Heitner (1963), who has, in fact, read the Wymetal dissertation, analyses the Aneas-Dido clash contained in Schlegel's Dido in much the same terms as Wymetal.[19] He makes a strong case for the play's didacticism. However, to stress this aspect of the play is merely another way of classifying

---

[18]Wymetal, Charlotte von. "The hero and his opponent in the heroic tragedy from Gottsched to Lessing." Unpub. Diss. (New Haven, 1954).

[19]Heitner, Robert. German Tragedy in the Age of the Enlightenment (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963).

Schlegel as Gottschedian; whereas in Schlegel's theory it is quite clear that the derivation of aesthetic and dramatic pleasure was the main purpose of the theatre, not moral teaching. Staiger (1963) is preoccupied with the change in language and style in the drama of the eighteenth century.[20] He devotes an entire chapter of Stilwandel to an analysis of the raging women in the German tragedy of the eighteenth century; this chapter includes a study of Dido in her moments of rage and fury at losing the love of Aeneas. He sees the language and tragic style used by Schlegel in this play as an indicator of the change in style that would eventually take place under Lessing. Peter Wolf (1964) gives perhaps the most detailed attention to Dido of any of the critics.[21] He spends a good deal of his chapter on Dido analysing the plot, the speeches and the language contained in the play and the inevitable conflict between Dido and Aeneas. In spite of this, he fails to give any theoretical framework to Schlegel's drama; indeed, the only reference to dramatic theory is to Gottsched's Critische Dichtkunst. He does not attempt to relate what he finds in this drama to the later theoretical treatises of Schlegel. Kaiser (1966) devotes a page to Schlegel's major tragedies, Canut and Hermann, his comedies and theoretical writings, but he does not inform the reader that the dramatist wrote a play based on Vergil's epic.[22] He does, however, stress the significance of Schlegel's theory of imitation, showing that he was not entirely Gottschedian, as some critics presume, but rather influenced more by Bodmer and Breitinger. Gysi (1966) commits quite an academic

---

[20]Staiger, Emil. "Rasende Weiber in der deutschen Tragödie des 18. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zum Problem des Stilwandels." Stilwandel (Zürich, 1963).

[21]Wolf, Peter. Die Dramen Johann Elias Schlegels (Zürich, 1964).

[22]Kaiser, Gerhard. Von der Aufklärung bis zum Sturm und Drang 1730-1789 (Gütersloh, 1966).

blunder.[23] The passage about Johann Elias Schlegel in his book - copied almost verbatim from Hermann Hettner without any form of acknowledgement - refers twice to his 1739 drama as "Dino (1732)." "Bibliographische Angaben [Schlegels]. Trauerspiele: Dino (1732) Orest und Pylades (1737) Lukretia (1740) Die Trojanerinnen (1742) Hermann (1743) Canut (1746).[24] Stahl and Yuill (1970) dismiss Dido as Gottschedian, too formal in its structure, too heavy in its use of alexandrines, achieving little poetic distinction, whilst at the same time giving some attention to Schlegel's dramatic theory and his tragedies Hermann and Canut.[25] Wilkinson (1973) makes a strong case for Schlegel's aesthetical and theoretical writings.[26] She takes even further the point made by Antoniewicz and then Schonder - that Schlegel was an important forerunner of Lessing and the Storm and Stress dramatists; Schlegel is, for her, the German pioneer in aesthetics whose theoretical writings possessed considerable vision for the time in which he lived and worked. Schlegel's pioneering work consisted of recognizing that art in all its forms must be different from life itself in order to derive aesthetic pleasure. Progress in aesthetics has been extremely rapid since the eighteenth century, but that must never be allowed to detract from the advance that Schlegel's theory of aesthetics gave to art and the theatre during the Age of the Enlightenment. Indeed, Wilkinson makes the claim that we can better appreciate the peak reached by Goethe and Schiller in their classical dramas if we have a clear understanding of the beginnings made by Schlegel.

---

[23] Gysi, Klaus. Aufklärung (Berlin, 1966).

[24] Ibid., p. 226.

[25] Stahl, E.L., and Yuill, W.E. German Literature in the 18th and 19th Centuries (London, 1970).

[26] Wilkinson, Elizabeth. Johann Elias Schlegel as a German Pioneer in Aesthetics (Darmstadt, 1973).

Histories of the eighteenth century period, particularly those with special reference to the Age of the Enlightenment, do not throw very much light on to this, the third of Schlegel's tragedies. Much more has been written about his comedies where he shows considerable interest in the psychology of the emotions and the portrayal of the lengths to which females will go in order to fulfil their desires, e.g., Der Triumph der guten Frauen and Die stumme Schönheit. Any reference to Schlegel's portrayal of passion in tragedy, particularly in Dido, is very minimal. Apart from Wolf's attempt to throw light on to Schlegel's dramas, which included a chapter of 25 pages on Dido, there have only been approximately 750 lines of criticism written in the secondary literature about this drama. That would approximate to 45-50 pages that have been written by the critics in reference to Dido. Only nine of the critics mentioned in this review - Bünemann, Creizenach, Eugen Wolff, Rentsch, Staiger, Heitner, Wymetal, Peter Wolf and Semrau - have contributed to the critical literature on Dido. It is in this light that one has a distant sense that Schlegel, the tragedian, and more particularly, his drama Dido, has been forgotten; many critics see value and significance in Schlegel's dramatic theory but neglect to assess his practice; others see value in only certain tragedies of Schlegel. Even those who devote specific attention to Dido either interpret the play in terms of Gottschedian theory or fail to give a theoretical framework to the play. Nowhere does any critic relate Dido to Schlegel's theory of imitation and his intention to introduce strongly drawn characters, particularly through the portrayal of passion in a noble heroine.

CHAPTER III

THE PLOT OF DIDO

"Die Darstellung einer Leidenschaft, die, allherrschend, zum Wahnsinn wird und den Träger vernichtet." (Wolf, Peter. Die Dramen Johann Elias Schlegels [Zürich, 1964], p. 46.)

Schlegel's Dido, written in 1739, was not published until five years later in Gottsched's Deutscher Schaubühne nach den Regeln und Mustern der Alten, Fünfter Theil.[1] True to his dramatic theory, the dramatist placed an emphasis on character depiction, rather than on the force of circumstances; in this case, particularly, he emphasises the portrayal of passion in a noble queen. In attempting to achieve the style of high tragedy, Schlegel presents a problematic figure as the protagonist of the play; like other dramatists in the eighteenth century, he finds that a passionate heroine has far more possibilities for a character study than her more stereotyped male counterpart.[2]

The basic outline of the plot comes from the Dido episode in Vergil's Aeneid. Here, as in Vergil's version, Dido's relationship to Aeneas is not the result of a casual fancy or inclination, "sondern ist bestimmt durch den Zwang einer angeworfenen, zerstörerischen Leidenschaft."[3]

---

[1] Leipzig, pp. 191-244, 1744.

[2] Essentially, the tragic heroine became the focal-point for character studies during the latter half of the eighteenth century. However, this is not to say that they had not proved popular prior to this. Indeed they did, particularly in French classical tragedy, e.g., Racine's Phèdre and Andromaque and also in certain seventeenth century German dramas, e.g., Lohenstein's Sophonisbe.

[3] Wolf, op. cit., p. 42.

Dido is the victim of this ravaging passion; Aeneas is the object of it. It reduces love to base desire and everything becomes secondary to Dido's need to possess. Inevitably, such a passion is destructive. Moreover, the question arises as to whether Dido has truly won Aeneas' love or whether he was, in fact, overwhelmed by her powerful personality and succumbed without ever realising why.

The play begins with Aeneas' reaction to the gods' announcement that he must continue his journey and leave Dido, whose hospitality he has recently enjoyed. Aeneas plans to get his ships ready for departure but delays informing Dido of his plan until a more favourable opportunity; for Aeneas knows that this news will upset the passionate queen. He hopes to take leave of Dido when he goes on a hunt to which she has invited him. Cunningly, he has kept his fleet prepared for battle under the pretext that Dido's brother, Pygmalion, may attack Carthage at any time. However, Dido's suspicions are aroused since she is now fully aware that her brother is dead. She has, however, no time to act on these suspicions, for Carthage is now faced with the threat of another attack, this time from Hiarbas, the King of Libya, who threatens to destroy the city if Dido does not give him her hand in marriage.

Dido is convinced that Aeneas is trying to deceive her. She becomes a cauldron of mixed emotions - her love battles with her offended pride which demands vengeance. Consequently, Dido ignores Hiarbas' offer and meets Aeneas in order to establish the truth. She will be convinced he is not deceiving her if he destroys his ships. Aeneas then tells her of his imminent departure, as it is the will of the gods; he is compelled to go, although he wishes that he could stay. At this, Dido breaks out into rage and despair. Aeneas, completely taken aback by this, tells her he will stay longer in order to help save Carthage from the threat

of Hiarbas. But Dido rejects Aeneas' offer of help, maintaining that her subjects can defend the city. Once Aeneas has left, she orders the destruction of the Trojan fleet and then goes to confront Hiarbas. Dido gives Hiarbas to believe that Aeneas himself has burnt his ships so as to stand by the city in its need. Later, Aeneas encounters Hiarbas by chance and learns of Dido's intention to destroy his fleet. Aeneas now goes to see Dido once again in order to explain his position and thereby justify himself.

When she meets Aeneas again, Dido is outwardly calm. She appeals to his sense of loyalty and attempts to persuade him to put off his departure. She cannot, however, keep up a composed appearance and suddenly she loses control of herself again. In her anger she tells Aeneas that he has been tricked, his fleet destroyed and that he will forcibly be held back in Carthage. However, she has not reckoned with Hiarbas; and the news that he is approaching the city walls plunges Dido into even greater despair. Moreover, Bitias brings the news that the attempt to burn Aeneas' fleet has been foiled; the Trojans have saved their ships. She broods over her unfaithfulness to her late husband; after she thinks she has seen the apparition of Sichäus, she considers killing herself. It is left to Anna, her sister and confidante, to remind her of her obligation towards her subjects as their queen. As a result, Dido receives ambassadors from Hiarbas, ostensibly to meet his offer; but in her heart she determines to deceive him.

At the start of the fifth act, Dido is beside herself with madness. Her attempt to make peace with Hiarbas has come to nought. The destruction of the city seems imminent. Dido now makes what to all appearances is a courageous decision - she decides to accede to Hiarbas' demands and then kills herself, thereby saving the city. Anna arrives with the news

that Aeneas has returned to rout the Libyans before taking his final leave of Carthage, but alas, she comes too late: Dido has already killed herself with her lover's sword.

In the main Schlegel has kept closely to his source. He does, however, add a political motif to the basic love theme contained in Vergil's epic. Hiarbas, King of the barbaric Libyan tribe, threatens to destroy the city. Dido can save it by accepting his hand in marriage. Hiarbas is then defeated by Aeneas, Dido's former lover, who is about to set sail to Italy. Schlegel therefore makes Hiarbas an active participant in the plot, a character with whom both Aeneas and Dido are forced to reckon. Semrau maintains that Dido does not merely kill herself because her passionate love for Aeneas has not been requited; she does it also to save the city of Carthage from the tyranny of the Libyans.[4]

This addition to Vergil's ancient legend was not an innovation on Schlegel's part. It was first used in Le Franc de Pompignan's Didon (1734) and many critics are of the opinion that Schlegel adapted the Hiarbas plot from this source.[5] However, Hiarbas had been present in the mythological background and Le Franc de Pompignan was merely using an episode that already existed. The origins of the Hiarbas episode go deep into classical mythology and experts are not altogether sure as to whether Hiarbas actually existed or

---

[4]Semrau, Eberhard, Dido in der deutschen Dichtung (Berlin und Leipzig, 1930), p. 51.

[5]cf. Bünemann, H. Elias Schlegel und Wieland als Bearbeiter antiker Tragödien (Leipzig, 1928), p. 54ff., and Creizenach, Wilhelm "Besprechung von Eugen Wolffs Buch über Schlegel," Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 22 (1890), p. 231, as opposed to Rentsch, J. J.E. Schlegel als Trauerspieldichter Diss. (Erlangen, 1890), p. 43, who does not share the view put forward by Bünemann and Creizenach.

whether he was created by a classical author. Some critics maintain that the Hiarbas episode is recounted in Vergil's Aeneid,[6] whereas others[7] suggest that Hiarbas is left out of Vergil's legend entirely. Even those who maintain that Hiarbas is included in the Aeneid do not make it clear as to whether the Dido-Hiarbas and the Dido-Aeneas episodes are dealt with separately or collectively. It would appear feasible, in light of the apparent discrepancy among the critics of classical mythology, to contend that, if the Hiarbas episode were included in the Aeneid, it must have been a separate entity to Dido's affair with Aeneas. This conjectured contention became validated upon re-reading Vergil's Aeneid, which makes it abundantly clear that the Hiarbas episode was not included in the epic. However, Hiarbas does get a mention, but only as the one who brought Dido's affair with Aeneas to the attention of Jupiter. The whole destiny of Aeneas had been the subject of a dispute amongst the gods and it had been the work of the goddess Venus, who, through Ascanius, poured a love potion on the eyes of Aeneas just before he set eyes on Dido, that had caused the love affair to begin, in order to thwart Jupiter's wish to see him re-found Troy. As a consequence of hearing from Hiarbas about the affair, Jupiter immediately re-issued the command for Aeneas to fulfil his destiny and thus leave Carthage.

Le Franc de Pompignan's innovation was to combine the Dido-Aeneas episode of Vergil's Aeneid and the Dido-Hiarbas episode of mythology into one drama. As such his play became the object that

---

[6]See E. Tripp, Cromwell's Handbook of Classical Mythology (New York, 1970), pp. 312, and W.H. Roscher, Ausführliches Lexicon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie (Leipzig, 1890-1897), II, pp. 97.

[7]See H. Hunger, Lexicon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie (Wien, 1969), pp. 106.

Schlegel imitated when writing Dido. Bünemann goes so far as to suggest that this secondary plot was borrowed from Le Franc de Pompignan's Didon in order to enliven the action in the French classical manner.[8] However, it seems more feasible to argue that Schlegel introduced the Hiarbas plot in the interests of character portrayal. He retained the traditional Aeneas-Dido legend where the tragic conflict between the two protagonists was basically an emotional struggle. However, at the time when Schlegel was writing, such a struggle was deemed unworthy of a tragic figure. Yet Dido's passionate love for Aeneas was an integral part of the legend and essential to the dramatic action. He realised, therefore, that he had to counterbalance her passion by a trait that, to the literary taste of that time, was more commendable. As a result he compensated shrewdly for Dido's feminine weakness by ostensibly placing an emphasis on her strength and determination as a queen. Yet, by attempting to appease the dictates of the time, Schlegel was almost confronted with a tragic conflict that was dramatically ineffective; for Dido, to all appearances now virtuous, was opposed to Aeneas, whose character had appeared virtuous from the start. He was therefore forced to rely on a third person, Hiarbas, to instigate the conflict proper; only after this could Schlegel concentrate on the tragic heroine's passion with its unreasoning attempts to retain her lover. Moreover, the presence of Hiarbas stirred Aeneas from his complacent inactivity to take up arms on behalf of his former lover. The problem facing Schlegel as a dramatist writing in the first half of the eighteenth century was that of "pouring a subject fraught with passion into the mould of the classical tragedy without depriving it

---

[8] Bünemann, op. cit., p. 54.

of its emotional appeal."[9] To overcome this and present a play that was dramatically pleasing was no easy matter.

Schlegel uses Aeneas as the foil for Dido's passionate nature; his temperament is diametrically opposed to that of Dido, and this immediately brings tension into their relationship and into the play. He is somewhat unmoved by Dido's pain and suffering and remains so throughout the play; it is almost as if he cannot understand her reaction at all. Even though he obeys the gods and eventually carries out their command, it is Dido, not Aeneas, who wins the sympathy of the spectator - for she is the real victim of their directive, she is up against the will of the gods, represented in a figure who must fulfil his destiny.

Immediately, Schlegel has created a sense of inevitability. Dido and Aeneas, past lovers, now have differing interests because of the gods. The situation is rife for intrigue and it will not take much for the differences between Aeneas and Dido to explode into a conflict. Reason stands opposed by passions, obedience by self-interest; and once the conflict emerges, with all its undertones and devastating effects, tragedy becomes the inevitable outcome.

Dido's tense relationship with Aeneas is only one element, however, that is used by Schlegel to heighten this sense of tragic inevitability. Very cleverly he uses his strict adherence to the unities of time and place to increase dramatic tension in the play; because every situation is closely constricted by time and place, there is always pressure on the protagonists to make a decision. While Aeneas is having to decide whether to depart from Carthage or not, before and at the very beginning

---

[9] Wymetal, Charlotte von, "The Hero and his opponent in the heroic tragedy from Gottsched to Lessing," Unpub. Diss. (New Haven, 1954), p. 157.

of the play, the threat of Pygmalion is a real one and both Dido and Aeneas have to reckon with it.[10] The news of his death is an event that we hear of during the play (Act I, scene 4; Werke I, 85) and this news in itself immediately adds to the atmosphere of suspense and uncertainty that surrounds the first meeting of Dido with Aeneas. Similarly, the threat of Hiarbas later in the play - his army stationed at the city walls, ready for battle - forces Dido to come to a rapid decision concerning her regal obligation to her subjects; unknown to the queen, this same threat stirs Aeneas into action as well. The very shortage of time, brought about by Schlegel's adherence to the unities, is the crucial catalyst which forces both Dido and Aeneas to act decisively. In the heroine's case, having to decide quickly greatly reduces the probability of her decision being a reasoned one, and this, conversely, greatly increases the probability of a tragic outcome.

In addition, Schlegel has given Dido's private decisions a public significance, for she is also Queen of Carthage, responsible for the protection of her subjects. As the drama progresses and Dido becomes more and more irrational, she tends to lose sight of this particular dimension; but in the structure of the drama it is nonetheless significant, for the dramatist uses this aspect to increase the immensity of Dido's tragedy, thereby heightening dramatic tension for the reader who knows that every personal decision made by the queen in her state of dementia affects the well-being and future of so many people.

It is in this light that Wolf's comment, quoted at the beginning of this chapter, is so apt; for the play shows a passion, which, without any form of restraint or constraint, turns into madness and destroys

---

[10] Wolf, op. cit., p. 48.

the very person whose passion it is. Gottsched saw this aspect of the play and expressed his favour for this play over Schlegel's Hermann - "weil sie mehr zärtliche und starke Leidenschaften, einen natürlichen Ausdruck und weniger Lehrsprüche in sich hält als jener. Hier redet das Herz mehr."[11] This is praise indeed, particularly since Hermann was written under Gottsched whereas Dido was not. Yet in spite of Gottsched's praise, Dido was not a successful play; nor did Schlegel himself value it too highly. The main reason for its failing could also have been the mainspring of Gottsched's praise - for Schlegel had in fact followed the theatrical technique of the French too closely. The unities of time and place are too strictly observed and as a result the play suffers from not enough action.[12] The emphasis is laid intentionally on the character of Dido; Schlegel uses her emotion-charged speeches to achieve this effect. Further, the whole tragedy is written in the French-influenced alexandrines and this also works to the detriment of the dramatic action, for "in diesem Vermaß konnte man nie nach freiem Bedarf verstummen, sondern mußte weiterreden, mußte vernünfteln und das Für und Wider jeder Sache gegeneinanderstellen."[13] The main reason for its shortcomings as a tragedy was therefore that it was too French-orientated. Its failings were, however, "durch die Struktur der Zeit bedingt."[14] The play's potential, contained in the passionate character of Dido and her intense emotional struggle with both Aeneas and Hiarbas,

---

[11] J. Christoph Gottsched, "Vorrede," Die deutsche Schaubühne, Fünfter Theil (Leipzig, 1744), p. 15.

[12] Schum, A., Studien zur deutschen Alexandrinertragödie, Diss. (Würzburg, 1919), p. 50ff. Schum points out that this is a common phenomenon in such tragedies.

[13] Köster, Albert, Die Literatur der Aufklärungszeit (Heidelberg, 1925), p. 80.

[14] Semrau, op. cit., p. 56.

was inevitably dampened by the rationalistic age in which it was written. Moreover, Schlegel was unwittingly attempting something that lay beyond his powers - "ein Seelendrama" - the depiction of the innermost recesses of the heroine's soul during her spiritual conflict; for no-one had ever used the language of the first half of the eighteenth century in such a way as to prove that it was capable of conveying this effect; nor was the audience of the time capable of viewing a human being in a way that such a drama requires, in complete totality.

CHAPTER IV

SCHLEGEL'S CHARACTERIZATION OF THE TRAGIC HEROINE

> "Liebe wird zur Begierde und muß, unbefriedigt, in Haß umschlagen."
> (Wolf, Peter. Die Dramen Johann Elias Schlegels [Zürich, 1964], p. 54).

In the eighteenth century it was very much in vogue to re-write epics; Schlegel was no exception to this trend. Yet he never merely copied the ancient epic of Vergil, but made the character of Dido, the heroine, the central focus of the play; further, her character is essentially different from the Dido portrayed in Vergil's Aeneid.[1] This evidences the fact that Schlegel's imitation does in fact possess many salient differences from the natural object and as such his characterization of Dido can rightfully claim to be creative art, and not merely Gottschedian in its essence. Vergil portrays Dido as a woman who is abandoned by her lover and describes in detail her feelings, emotions, her inner struggle and her eventual destruction as a result of this event. Her noble standing as a Princess serves only to heighten the tragic elements in her fateful struggle; but the different roles of lover and queen are not easily distinguished, for it is Dido the complete woman who fights for her love and is eventually destroyed by the struggle.

Es kam Virgil auf die psychologische Vertiefung an. Ein empirisch-rationalistisch eingestelltes Zeitalter hat für einen derartigen

---

[1] Bünemann, H., Elias Schlegel und Wieland als Bearbeiter antiker Tragödien (Leipzig, 1928), p. 90.

Seelenmenschen wenig übrig, es würde ihn als 'abgeschmackt' verwerfen. So stellt der Aufklärer die Leidenschaftlichkeit in den Vordergrund.[2]

Schlegel's Dido has the same passionate nature but her nobility of character is emphasised as a balance to it. To Schlegel it was of the uppermost importance that an emphasis be placed upon Dido's role as queen, as the reader of the day still thought along Aristotelian lines, i.e. that the hero of tragedy must be noble; he was not yet at the stage of Lessing and Miss Sara Sampson, a girl of middle-class background. Dido's noble status added to the public versus private conflict that was another trend evidenced in the plays of the late seventeenth, early eighteenth century. This was a conflict between one's public duty and one's private inclinations. Schlegel's Dido is not one to be caught up with such a "Pflicht und Neigung" inner conflict; by emphasising her role as queen, the dramatist has imposed this problematical situation upon her. In the final analysis she has no choice; although she wishes to follow her own desires, Anna reminds her of her duty as queen to her subjects, and Dido is compelled, by the urgency of the situation facing Carthage, to consider the needs of her citizens. As a noble queen, her language does not degenerate into vulgar expressions of feelings and emotions in the main; Schlegel has concentrated on portraying her in moments of furious anger, inconsolable grief and her consequent mental disintegration. As her mind begins to come under strain and she bursts forth with an unrelenting fury and grief in Act IV, scene 6, Dido suddenly comes out with a very natural line, a line which stands out from the rest of the alexandrines; as Anna asks her if her death wish is the only consolation for such a noble

---

[2] Semrau, E., Dido in der deutschen Dichtung (Berlin und Leipzig, 1930), p. 53.

heroine, she replies: "Ich weis nicht; dies weis ich, daß ich mich tödlich quäle." (Act IV, 6; Werke I, 126) Dido only resorts to common expressions in moments when she is beside herself with fury or grief. She is above all a noble queen whose very demeanour inspires the admiration of her subjects and yet one who is constantly plagued by her unfaithfulness to her late husband and whose pride will never allow her to accept the fact of Aeneas' departure from Carthage. Her capacity to love has, because of her situation, become more and more a passionate desire; and as this desire fails to gain its object, Aeneas, it turns into a fury and a hatred which brings so much pressure on to her mind that Dido eventually begins to disintegrate as a person and commits suicide. In her relationship to her subjects we see Dido's love and concern for them and their admiration for her; Hiarbas shows us the attraction that the noble character of Dido holds for him, but the Queen of Carthage rebuffs him with pride and disdain; as we examine her relationship to Aeneas we begin to see Dido's love and passion slowly but surely changing to hatred and resentment as her suspicions about her lover are first aroused and then confirmed; and finally, we see the effect of this development on the mind of the heroine - disintegration as a person and the consequent suicide.

1. Dido's relationship to her subjects

Schlegel's strict adherence to the unity of time works against his portrayal of Dido in a way. He cannot show her as the caring, almost motherly sovereign she was before her crisis began, nor can he show her initial happiness with Aeneas; he has to begin too high on the crescendo scale towards her despair. As a consequence, he cannot show her hesitancy at breaking her vow to her late husband's memory, her

happiness with Aeneas and then the beginning of despair. Nor is there time to portray the personal conflict through which Aeneas must have gone before deciding to leave his love. Understandably, therefore, at no time was Schlegel able to show Dido relating with her subjects before Aeneas arrived on the scene; nowhere is he permitted to show the citizens of Carthage paying homage and adoration to their worthy queen. However, Bitias does, at one point in the play, make reference to the time that Dido and her subjects spent together prior to and during their daring sea voyage to Africa and Carthage. While Dido is thanking her subjects for their loyal support, Bitias comments that they consider themselves fortunate to have such a queen as their leader:

> Du dankest uns für das, was wir für Glück geschätzt.
> Dein sanftes Regiment lässt uns ein Land vergessen,
> Wo ein verhaßter Fürst der Bürger Gut gefressen. (Act III, 3; Werke I, 105)

In these few lines Bitias gives us a glimpse of the homage and adoration that Dido's subjects paid to her before the play even began. During the drama, however, we never see the citizens of Carthage lauding their queen. Nevertheless, in the midst of this despairing crisis, Dido's relationship with her subjects, their faithful trust in her and her concern for them as citizens of her realm, is very much a part of the drama, even if not always apparent.

This relationship of trust and concern is a long-standing one. Dido led her subjects on a daring sea voyage across the ocean in order to be free from the tyranny they were under and set up their own city. They reached Africa and established the city of Carthage. During this adventure Dido won the unending respect, admiration and obedience of her subjects. To them she is a noble queen of great honour; as Anna says:

Ein Weib, das unternahm, was sich kein Mann erkühnet,
Das uns durchs weite Meer zur Führerinn gedienet,
Das, wo sich auch kein Schiff zu landen sonst getraut,
Auf wilder Barbarn Strand, uns eine Stadt erbaut;
...
- O daß von solcher Ehre,
Als du erjaget hast, mein Leben fruchtbar wäre! (Act IV, 6; Werke I, 126)

Bitias confirms the steadfastness of the citizens of Carthage when Dido asks whether they are ready and willing to defend her; they are ready to take on the whole of Africa for their queen:

Ja, Königinn, man brennt vor Eifer, dich zu rächen,
Und auch ganz Afrika würd unsern Muth nicht schwächen.
(Act III, 3; Werke I, 105)

The respect that was built up during that mammoth sea adventure was not, however, a one-sided affair; Dido has a great deal of concern and affection for her subjects:

Ich sehe voller Dank die Treue dieser Stadt,
Die Lieb und Mitleid bloß mit Volk erfüllet hat.
Freywillig habt ihr mich durchs wilde Meer begleitet,
Wohin mich meine Furcht und mein Verdruß geleitet;
Und euer Vaterland den Wüsten nachgesetzt.
...
Itzt seh ich euch bereits mit Waffen in der Hand;
Nicht, weil man euer Feld und euer Gut entwandt;
Nur mich vor der Gewalt des Barbars zu beschützen,
Der meine Liebe sucht, auf meinem Thron zu sitzen. (Ibid.)

In spite of their seeing the queen's fear on the one hand and her anger on the other, Dido's subjects are strong in their allegiance to her; they will not stand by and see her overwhelmed by a barbarian! Dido greatly respects them for this; indeed, the bond between them is so strong that it is only broken by Dido's death. True enough, it is seriously weakened by the queen's mental state towards the end of the play; but as far as the citizens are concerned, she is still their queen to whom their allegiance is devoted.

In the midst of Dido's crisis, Anna does not hide her admiration of her queen's tenacity and strength of character:

> Ach Schwester, wie gesetzt, wie groß ist doch dein Geist!
> Der mitten in der Noth sich unerschrocken weist.
> Du kennest nicht die Furcht, die uns das Glück erwecket,
> Und lachst bey der Gefahr, die Männerherzen schrecket.
> (Act II, 3; Werke I, 91)

And yet Anna's response to Dido is not merely one of admiration; like a true friend and confidante she addresses the queen quite firmly when she deems it necessary for her stability:

> Ach Schwester! Furcht und Angst rührt den besorgten Geist,
> Wenn dein gepeinigt Herz mir seine Schlüße weist.
> Du folgest allzusehr der Regung deiner Seelen,
> Und lässest dich dein Herz nach eignem Willen quälen.
> Denk itzt an deine Stadt. (Act IV, 2; Werke I, 119)

She appeals to Dido's respect and concern for her subjects; for they, in return, expect a sense of loyalty to them in their queen.

Unfortunately, the news brought by Bitias that the Trojans have saved their ships greatly affects Dido's relationship with her subjects; for, with her mind now under terrible pressure, she cannot contain her frenzied anger and, for a moment, her loving concern for her subjects is replaced by a biting scorn. "Feig und verzagtes Volk!" (Act IV, 3; Werke I, 121) she calls them, implying that they have let her down; Dido therefore feels that it is her subjects and not she who have disrupted their relationship founded on trust and respect. This is, however, not the case. Nevertheless, Anna disregards the queen's outburst and spends all her time trying to calm the disquietened Dido, particularly when the latter imagines she is seeing the ghost of her late husband. In spite of Dido's resentful remarks to her citizens, they never lose their concern for her well-being. Anna is the notable

example of this unqualified allegiance but it is also apparent in Bitias and Barce. Indeed, the Captain's reporting that "Das Volk versammlet sich und eilet nach den Wällen,/Und will den Lybiern sich kühn entgegen stellen," (Act IV, 5; Werke I, 123) suggests that all Dido's subjects are willing to fight to the death for her. Bitias confirms this when he informs the queen that "man stürmt, und alles streitet." (Act V, 2; Werke I, 123) As the crisis nears its tragic outcome, Barce pleads with her queen to accept defeat for the city of Carthage, if that is the only way to save Dido's own life - "Wähl unsern Untergang, und meide deinen Tod!" (Act V, 1; Werke I, 131) However, Dido's mind is too deranged at this point in time for reasoning to have the desired effect and her death prompts cries of anguish and grief from the lips of Anna, Barce and Bitias:

> Anna: O Leid! O Jammerstand!
> Hier sitzt sie halberblaßt, das Schwerd sinkt aus der Hand.
>
> Barce: Ach! war denn keine Kraft in meinen schwachen Händen
> Den abgezielten Stoß von ihrer Brust zu wenden.
>
> Bitias: Eilt doch, ihr beyzustehn, weil sich ihr Hauch noch rührt.
> (Act V, 4; Werke I, 136)

Such was the dedicated allegiance of the subjects of Carthage to their queen.

Dido at one time shared the intensity of this allegiance with her subjects - her loyalty to them was as strong as theirs to her. However, with pressure mounting through the double blow of losing Aeneas and having to face Hiarbas, Dido's mind and personality began to disintegrate under the strain; the end result of her deranged state of mind was that she ignored the impassioned requests of her subjects to avoid ending her own life at all costs, for that would be worse for them than coming

under enemy occupation, and, following her own distorted logic, decided to kill herself in order to save the city of Carthage from that same enemy occupation:

> Ich will erst meiner Stadt erwünschte Ruh erwerben...
> ... Mein Volk kann ruhig leben,
> Und ich Hiarben doch nicht Hand und Krone geben. (Act IV, 6; Werke I, 128)

It is true that Dido did in this way save the city of Carthage and also deny Hiarbas her hand in marriage; but in saving the city she had denied the citizens their wishes - to have Dido alive, as their queen and leader. No longer could the citizens of Carthage pay homage to their noble queen, no longer could they give her their undying devotion, for she is dead. Further, Dido sought consolation in death for her grief at losing Aeneas. The relationship of respect and concern in which Dido held her subjects had been understandably impaired by the disintegration of the heroine's mind and person. Yet, for her subjects, this relationship, which called for their unqualified allegiance, was never in question; such was the noble stature of Dido in their eyes.

2. Dido's relationship to Hiarbas

In the background to the play, Dido came into contact with Hiarbas, the King of Lybia almost immediately after her daring sea voyage to Africa. It was Hiarbas, a son of Jupiter and a Garamantian nymph, who sold the original site of Carthage to Dido so that she could establish her city and then attempted to court her; but Dido remained true to the memory of her late husband, Sichäus.[3] Later, Hiarbas conquered the city of Carthage, after Dido, distressed by the loss of her lover Aeneas,

---

[3] Tripp, Crommwell's Handbook of Classical Mythology (New York, 1970), p. 313.

refused his renewed proposal of marriage.[4] Tripp makes the point that it was the prayers of Hiarbas to Jupiter, his father, that led to Aeneas' desertion of the queen and he therefore contributed indirectly to her death.[5] Hunger maintains that all of this was true of Hiarbas and Dido in classical mythology but states that in Vergil's Aeneid we see a different Dido from the one of the Hiarbas episode.[6] Vergil, he suggests, concentrates merely on her affair with Aeneas. Semrau adds that the only role played by Hiarbas in Vergil's Aeneid was that of bringing Dido's affair with Aeneas to the notice of the gods, causing Jupiter to issue the command for Aeneas to leave Carthage in order to safeguard his destiny.[7]

In Schlegel's Dido, however, Hiarbas becomes an active participant in the plot; the Dido-Aeneas and Dido-Hiarbas episodes are interwoven in such a way that Hiarbas becomes a person with whom both Dido and Aeneas are continually forced to reckon. In the end Dido not only kills herself out of grief at the loss of Aeneas; but also because she believes she will save herself and her city from the hands of the barbarian intruder. Even though he is not on stage that often, Hiarbas is nevertheless essential to the dramatic plot; for his very presence outside Carthage as a political threat greatly increases the pressure and tension of Dido's dilemma, and, in the final analysis, causes Aeneas to act on behalf of the queen. Both Dido and Aeneas are forced to reckon

---

[4] W.H. Roscher, Ausführliches Lexicon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie (Leipzig, 1890 - 1897), II, p. 58.

[5] Op. cit.

[6] H. Hunger, Lexicon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie (Wien, 1969), p. 107.

[7] Semrau, op. cit., p. 51.

with him as a foe, as someone who is opposed to their own individual inclinations and duty. He may well be the barbarian opportunist that Dido imagines him to be, or he may be truly in love with the noble queen. Whatever his motives for threatening the city of Carthage may have been (he does not appear on stage often enough for the reader to make a realistic assessment of his motivation), one thing is absolutely certain: he plays a crucial role in the execution of the dramatic plot, for he it is who divulges Dido's plan to burn the Trojan fleet to Aeneas himself. Through the words of an unwitting intermediary, Aeneas finds out the extent to which Dido's fury and hatred is prepared to go; through all the scenes that he had spent with her, he had never detected any treachery in Dido's passion, nor had he understood it at all. Schlegel uses Hiarbas, the third person in the somewhat unusual "eternal triangle," to reveal to Aeneas the force of Dido's passion for him. Without Hiarbas, the plot would never be put into action; his role is that of an essential catalyst, designed to bring about the necessary reaction in Dido and Aeneas.

We first hear of Hiarbas and his threat to the city of Carthage at the end of Act I; in scene 5 Cloanth brings the rumour of his war-like activity to Achat. At this point in time Dido is completely unaware of the Lybian invaders. It is not until the beginning of Act II, scene 2, that Dido first learns of Hiarbas and his threatened invasion of Carthage. The news certainly makes its impact on both Dido and her subjects, but at this point in the play the queen is too much taken up with her suspicions of Aeneas and his departure to give the threat caused by Hiarbas serious consideration. Even when Bitias brings the news of the imminence of Hiarbas' attack on the city and of his sending on ambassadors to negotiate with her, (Act II, scene 2) Dido is not taken

aback; for she knows well that the barbarian king is enamoured of her person and her throne: "Ich bins, was er begehrt, und noch vielmehr mein Thron." (Act II, 2; Werke I, 90) Hiarbas is attracted to Dido just as Aeneas was; with one salient difference, however: Aeneas Dido still loves passionately, Hiarbas she despises with a passion of equal ferocity. In the midst of this crisis, Dido's noble spirit surges forth. She tells Bitias to command the people to arm themselves for a struggle against the invading barbarians; the ambassadors will see that Dido is not easily overwhelmed by force. Facing the danger of Hiarbas, Dido is courageous and composed and this elicits from Anna the response of admiration that is quoted in section one of this chapter:

> Ach Schwester, wie gesetzt, wie groß ist doch dein Geist!
> Der mitten in der Noth sich unerschrocken weist.
> Du kennest nicht die Furcht, die uns das Glück erwecket,
> Und lachst bey der Gefahr, die Männerherzen schrecket.
> (Act II, 3; Werke I, 91)

To the threat of Hiarbas Dido's response is that of a dignified queen - "Hiarbas schreckt mich nicht;" (Ibid.) - she is quite unafraid of the barbarian King. Unfortunately for Dido, the threat of Hiarbas is never an isolated event but is rather entangled with the events surrounding the departure of Aeneas. Dido can therefore only remain coldly composed in her response to Hiarbas as long as her doubts about Aeneas and his planned departure have not been confirmed. Once her suspicions have been proved true, her response to Hiarbas becomes more and more influenced by the cauldron of emotions that is beginning to seethe within her breast.

This is nowhere more evident than when Dido meets Hiarbas in Act III, scene 4. Dido herself is completely unaware that it is Hiarbas himself; she is under the impression that she is talking to one of his

ambassadors. Later, Hiarbas reveals his true identity, but not before Dido has informed him, in the form of an impassioned threat, that Aeneas will not leave her undefended; he is indeed burning his ships as a sign of standing by Dido. Once she finds out that the person she is addressing is Hiarbas himself, Dido begins to accuse the Lybian king of using his love as a mere pretext for obtaining her wealth. Hiarbas points out that his army could easily have attacked Carthage while the city was undefended, if booty was their sole object. No, Hiarbas has kept his troops at bay because he is in love with Dido and he wants her hand in marriage; the very reason for his delaying the invasion is to win over Dido and thereby avoid a battle. Dido, however, despises him to his face, telling him that she would hate him even if he were to fall at her feet. Hiarbas responds somewhat humourously: "Nein, dazu hab ich noch nicht Sitten genug gelernt." (Werke I, 109) In the end, however, Hiarbas is goaded by Dido's scorn into promising her the struggle that her words deserve; he will, in reality, be the barbarian that she thinks he is!

Dido storms off, leaving Hiarbas. Presently, Aeneas and his servants arrive on the scene expecting to meet Dido. Hiarbas, still smouldering with resentment towards Aeneas after his meeting with Dido, virulently tells him that he will pay for his decision to stand by the queen. Disdainfully he introduces himself and issues Aeneas with a threat: "Kämst du mir anderswo, als in der Stadt, entgegen,/So wollt ich deinen Trutz mit andern Mitteln legen." (Werke I, 111) Aeneas is, not surprisingly, taken aback by this. But he counters by informing Hiarbas that he is gravely miscalculating: "Meynest du, daß ausserhalb der Stadt/Aeneas gegen dich nicht auch noch Waffen hat?" (Werke I, 111)

Hiarbas merely scoffs at these words, for his attraction to Dido has caused him to be gullible to what she said about Aeneas; with animosity he sneers at Aeneas' decision to burn his fleet - the citizens of Carthage may then see him as their hero, but for Hiarbas and the Lybians it means that Aeneas cannot escape from them during the struggle:

> Bestärke nur dein Volk, bezeige dich als Held,
> Steck alle Schiff in Brand, wofern es dir gefällt:
> Denn sonsten fürcht ich nichts, als daß du mir entfliehest,
> Und durch ein leichtes Holz dich meiner Rach entziehest. (Werke I, 111)

This whole encounter with Hiarbas mystifies Aeneas. He cannot understand some of the obscure things the Lybian has said. Eventually, however, with the help of his friends and some inspired deduction, he realises that his fleet is in danger. Quickly he sends Ascan and Cloanth to stand guard against any attempt to destroy his ships. Hiarbas has in this scene with Aeneas fulfilled his crucial role; he unwittingly divulges Dido's plan of revenge to its intended victim, Aeneas.

Dido's informing Hiarbas of the plan to burn Aeneas' ships, with the implied threat that Aeneas himself is doing it in order to display his loyalty to her, is a calculated step on her part; telling it to Hiarbas in person, however, in the very place to which she had requested Aeneas to come for a final meeting, is most definitely not! (Inevitably, after Dido leaves, Hiarbas and Aeneas meet.) It is indeed an example of the surging force of passion within Dido; and at that moment in time her ability to reason was rendered powerless. Dido destroys her highest hopes by the very means she adopts to foster them. She thought that she could threaten Hiarbas by playing him off against Aeneas; her intention was to arouse envy and jealousy in Aeneas through a feigned alliance with Hiarbas. However, she had not reckoned with the emotional reaction

of both herself and Hiarbas to an unanticipated situation: the revelation that she had disclosed her ideas to Hiarbas himself disturbed Dido's emotional equilibrium and the queen's rebuffal of his proposal caused Hiarbas to become extremely jealous of and resentful towards Aeneas. As a consequence, Aeneas rather fortuitously finds out about the danger to his fleet.

Dido never meets Hiarbas again in person. However, as her mind begins to come under tension and stress, the queen is confronted by the imminent threat of Hiarbas and his army invading the city of Carthage. Yet, in spite of her feeling hemmed in on all sides by pressure from Aeneas, the ghost of Sichäus, her subjects' pleas, her own wishes and desires and now this barbarian intruder, Dido still retains, in essence, her nobility of character in rebuffing Hiarbas. If, as he protested in their meeting together in Act III, scene 4, he wants her and not her city of Carthage, then she will escape through suicide for the sake of her subjects and her own peace of mind:

> Hiarbas suchet mich, mich wünscht er zu umfassen:
> Wohlan! Wenn ich entflohn, wird er die Meinen lassen.
> Laß sehen, ob er wahr, ob falsch geredet hat?
> Laß sehn, was er begehrt, mich oder meine Stadt? (Act V, 2; Werke I, 134)

Dido then departs; she will kill herself for she has deluded herself into thinking that she can avenge herself on her enemies, Aeneas and Hiarbas, "mit andern Waffen" (Ibid.) - by haunting them with her ghost. The noble, yet passionate queen has found a loophole in the barbarian king's approach - if, as he maintains, he wants Dido and not the city of Carthage, then he will leave her citizens in peace when she is dead.

3. Dido's relationship to Aeneas

Aeneas' decision to leave Carthage is made before the play begins. The difficulty of that decision cannot be underestimated; it has all the makings of a tragic dilemma in itself. For that reason, Schlegel has set it outside the main framework of the drama so that Dido, the heroine, is the major character. The inflexibility of Aeneas' decision may initially lead to questions in the reader's mind - does he really love Dido or is it mere infatuation, has he become involved with a passionate queen merely to exploit her emotions and her possessions and is now moving on, is he in fact basically selfish in obeying the gods? To correct these impressions, Schlegel does everything possible to present Aeneas as a character worthy of our sympathy for the dilemma he faces. Indeed, the major revision he made of the first version was to add the part about Aeneas' conquest of Hiarbas before leaving Carthage;[8] he can hardly be accused, therefore, of leaving his lover Dido in the lurch. It is very much a part of the Aeneas legend that he is destined by the gods to reach Italy and re-found Troy. Consequently, his love affair with Dido must, of necessity, remain an episode for he has a "higher" duty to fulfil. It is not so much a lack of love on his part for Dido; rather it is a greater devotion to his calling. That is not to say that Aeneas has acted completely without affection or inner conflict; rather, his conflict between his love for Dido and his duty to the gods has, of necessity, taken place before the play began. In this way, Schlegel, writing in the very circumscribed Gottschedian style of tragedy, can concentrate all the emphasis on the turbulent inner conflict of Dido.

---

[8] Johann Heinrich Schlegel, "Vorbericht," Werke I, p. 71.

Once his decision has been taken, however, we then witness from the first Act onwards a deliberate cooling of his affections towards Dido - this is, after all, his only means of protecting himself and his emotions from the prospect of leaving and Dido's reaction to his decision.

It is in this state of mind that we first encounter Aeneas (Act I, scene 1). He is naturally concerned as to whether Dido realises that, in spite of his duty, he still loves her; his fear is that she will feel deceived and not attempt to understand the predicament facing him. Further, his father lost his life for disobeying the gods and the vacillating Aeneas naturally fears for his own life. Thoughts pertaining to his dilemma pervade his mind; on the one side stand the will of the gods, the powerful reminder of his father's fate, and his own misgivings about an arduous and uncertain journey and on the other his love for Dido and the comfort and prestige that he enjoys in her kingdom.[9] The prospect of going against the will of the gods is now a mere memory of his personal conflict that took place before the play began - he has decided to depart from Carthage. However, he realises that Dido will be against his departing, that he will offend her pride, and he expects her to voice her protests most vehemently. It is as he is steeling himself for his face-to-face confrontation with Dido to inform her of his decision that he reflects on his stay in Carthage. The dramatist is here using this reflection on the part of Aeneas to show us the relationship that existed between him and Dido in the immediate past. Her kingdom has been convenient for him, giving him and his army a secure haven; and Dido has showered him personally with her love and endless gifts:

---

[9] Wolf, Peter, op. cit., p. 47.

Sie wird sich über mich, und zwar mit Recht, beklagen.
Wie gerne schont ich sie! Wie schwer, wie voll Verdruß
Geh ich an dieses Werk! Jedoch, was hilfts? Ich muß.
Sie liebet mich, Achat. Ja, was ich noch mehr scheue,
Ich bin nicht ohne Schuld, und breche meine Treue. (Act I, 1; Werke I, 78)

Aeneas realises that Dido has a claim to his person and that she will understandably consider him faithless; this could put Aeneas under considerable pressure, but he is "a man of reason with emotions under perfect control."[10] The gods have commanded him to leave and virtue, duty and honour take precedence over emotions. "Die Ehre winkt: wohlan! Aeneas liebt nicht mehr." (Act I, 1; Werke I, 77) The suddenness and completeness of such a change of heart is neither absurd nor disgraceful, as long as one keeps in mind the rationalistic basis for it. Once an emotion is shown to be falsely directed, reason, which is sovereign, can snap it off abruptly.[11] The problem is that Dido is not controlled by reason but by her passions and she will not understand Aeneas' position; nor does he expect her to endeavour to understand it. Hence Aeneas' concern about the question of his faithlessness; for he knows that Dido, looking through the eyes of love, will have every justification in feeling rejected, and that he is indeed breaking his oath with her. Yet the significance of his statement - "Ich bin nicht ohne Schuld, und breche meine Treue" (op. cit.) - goes even deeper; for Aeneas knew at the very start of his relationship with Dido that his destiny was to obey the gods, and his very sojourn in Carthage has been evidence of a careless disregard for his duty. His episode with Dido

---

[10] Heitner, Robert, German Tragedy in the Age of the Enlightenment (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963), p. 91.

[11] Heitner, op. cit.

per se is his guilt, for in it he has temporarily broken faith with the gods and misled a passionate woman by not informing her of his duty but rather promising her eternal faithfulness. He therefore regrets the relationship ever starting:

> Ach! wie verwünscht mein Herz die unglücksvolle Stunde,
> Den Anfang unsrer Gluth, den Grund von unserm Bunde!
> Mein Mund beseufzt den Tag, und fluchet jener Jagd,
> Da wir uns allererst von Liebe vorgesagt.
> Wie viel hat Juno nicht durch diesen Tag gewonnen!
> Ich bin ihr nun vielleicht zum letztenmal entronnen.[12]

He also regrets his inability to contain his original attraction to Dido; at that point in time he was guilty of following his feelings and not his reason: "Achat, ach! hätt ich doch den ersten Trieb besiegt!" (Act I, 3; Werke I, 82) And yet he remembers how difficult it would have been for him not to be attracted to Dido's noble soul:

> Wie schwer ists doch, daß man ein edles Herz nicht liebt?
> Die Großmuth nimmt uns ein, und fesselt unsre Seelen,
> Und wer nicht lieben will, muß wenigstens sich quälen. (Act I,3; Werke I, 82)

This last line is significant. The noble attractiveness of Dido overwhelmed Aeneas and forced him either to love her or to torment himself in trying to free himself of the "feeling of unparalleled attractive power,"[13] that was capturing his soul. He did not therefore succumb to any unworthy passion aroused by a mere pretty face; he was, rather, captivated by the noble-mindedness of a regal queen. However, as their

---

[12] Act I, 1; Werke I, 79. Schlegel here makes a reference to mythology but does not follow it up. Juno has always been against Aeneas and the Trojans and this caused a fight amongst the gods themselves. The consequence of this struggle was Aeneas' affair with Dido, for it was Venus who caused Aeneas to fall in love with Dido.

[13] Heitner, op. cit., p. 91.

relationship developed, he became more and more aware that Dido's commitment to him was based more on passion than on rational love; and a passionate commitment brings with it the desire to possess and dominate, an impediment to the expression of rational love. It is at that point in time when Aeneas is gradually coming to this realisation that the gods chose to insist on their command. For Aeneas, the timing was favourable for this gave him a solid, rational justification for releasing himself from the fetters of Dido's passion in which he was becoming enveloped. Yet the decision to comply with the gods' command was nevertheless a difficult one for him, since he can vividly recall the basis of his attraction to Dido. Consequently, Aeneas is well aware that his parting with his lover will cause him pain; however, the gods have priority over his emotions and he would sooner be tormented emotionally than suffer the shame of punishment at the hands of the gods: "Die Trennung soll mich eh, als Scham und Reue quälen./Eh mich der Himmel straft, mag mich der Schmerz entseelen." (Act I, 1; Werke I, 79) He also realises that his reputation among the people of Carthage will sink, if he goes away. He consoles himself that his reputation lies in himself and his obedience to duty: "Mein Ruhm ist in mir selbst; mein Ruhm ist meine Pflicht." (Act I, 3; Werke I, 82)

Schlegel obviously uses Aeneas to set the scene for the basic conflict of the play; however, most of his speeches are purely and simply an extended process of rationalizing what he has, in fact, to do. Wolf is particularly discerning here: "Aeneas' Reden...reich an epigrammatisch formulierten Einsichten...sind Abwägen der Gründe gegeneinander, Suchen nach Rechtfertigung einer Entscheidung, die bereits feststeht."[14] The crucial issue of his dilemma is, put in a nut-shell,

---

[14] Wolf, op. cit., p. 47.

submission to the will of the gods. That is, however, more easily said than done! Aeneas is only too aware of Dido's passion and he fears the reception she will give him when he informs her of his impending departure:

> Wahr ists, der Königinn zum Zorn geneigte Brust,
> Ihr Herz, das eifrig liebt, ist mir nicht unbewußt,
> Mit allem, was sie weiß, wird sie mein Herz versuchen,
> Bald bittend vor mir stehen, bald meiner Untreu fluchen.
> (Act I, 1; Werke I, 79.)

Dido's heart and her keen love is well known to him; she will indeed try every available means to retain her lover - this is the basis for the dramatic plot.[15] Because he knows this, Aeneas wishes that he did not have to make the decision to depart, but could be free to follow his own inclinations:

> O wäre diese Wahl doch nur ein Werk von mir!
> Der unverrückte Schluß der Götter waltet hier.
> Die widerstehn allein der Neigung meiner Seele,
> Und wählen Latien, wenn ich Carthago wähle.
> Indessen bey der Jagd stell ich mich willig ein.
> Die Königinn befiehlt; ich will gehorsam sein. (Act I, 2; Werke I, 81.)

Dido, who had begun to suspect a lack of ardour on the part of Aeneas, and needed a re-affirmation of his love for her in order to feel secure, has sent Bitias, her servant, to request Aeneas to accompany her on another hunt - the very environment where they first talked of love. Dido's desire to re-affirm their love is accompanied by the need to clear her own mind of the suspicion that Aeneas is about to desert her. Aeneas thus complies with Dido's request; he agrees to go on the hunt when he should be planning and organizing his departure. Not only is he falling

---

[15] Wolf, op. cit., p. 49.

into Dido's plan but it also appears to the returning Achat that he has reversed his original decision. However, this is not inconsistency on Aeneas' part; for, just as he obeys the gods and their authoritative command, so he recognises the authority of Dido, the queen, through obedience to her request. Aeneas, himself, never comes across as a character possessing personal authority; Schlegel has intentionally portrayed him as a weak character so that he never becomes the central character of the play. It is this aspect of his character, however, that has led Semrau to question whether his love for Dido has ever been firmly rooted, given that it has passed the stage of an inquisitive infatuation with a passionate female of noble birth:

> Aeneas bändigt seine Triebe nicht, er hat gar keine, hat nie welche gehabt. Er kämpft keinen Kampf zwischen Liebe und Pflicht, um sich schließlich für die Pflicht zu entscheiden; sondern er ist bloßes Werkzeug in der Hand der Götter, ein unselbständiges, blind gehorchendes Wesen, daß zudem seine Ohnmacht wohl fühlt und darum eine Anklage gegen die harten Götter spricht. Didos Vorwürfen steht er sprachlos gegenüber; sie tut ihm leid, er bedauert sie, er möchte ja gern treu sein, aber es geht nun eben nicht.[16]

As Semrau points out later, however, the fault lies not so much in Aeneas' character as in Schlegel's characterization. The dramatist was endeavouring to portray Aeneas as a man of reason who had conquered his feelings in order to follow his "higher" destiny and yet the attempt proved beyond the dramaturgical ability he possessed while at Schulpforta. "Einen Stoiker will Schlegel darstellen, indessen zeichnet er einen Schwächling, ewig reflektierend, nie handelnd, doch in seiner Nüchternheit ganz farblosen Aufklärungsmenschen."[17] This would seem to suggest that Dido has fallen in love with a weak and terribly indifferent character,

---

[16] Semrau, op. cit., p. 54-55.

[17] Semrau, op. cit., p. 55.

someone who is unworthy of the love of a great queen. One must, however, remember that during the initial stages of their love Aeneas was a man of great stature - how else could such a proud passionate queen break her vow to remain faithful to her late husband's memory - whose manly exploits held considerable appeal for Dido. During the short period in which the tragedy is set, however, we never see this side of Aeneas, and this is one of the major shortcomings of the play; for the strictures of the three unities, to which Schlegel rigidly adhered, have caused Aeneas to be portrayed in such a way that he appears almost unworthy of Dido's love, and this in turn tends to detract from the stature of Dido herself. This is not the impression Schlegel intended; the rigidity of the Gottschedian "unity of time" concept largely worked against him for the dramatist could only begin his characterization of Aeneas after he had made his decision to depart.

For some time now Aeneas has been in a privileged position in Carthage; he has experienced nothing but love and he is therefore deeply indebted to Dido. Indeed, the citizens of Carthage even revere him as their future king.[18] However, Aeneas' speech to Bitias (Act 1, scene 2) suggests that all the kindnesses and adulation that he has received in the three months he has stayed in Carthage are, in fact, an embarrassment; he claims they have been foisted upon him against his own wishes. Aeneas has been slow to realize how passionate Dido's nature can be; more significantly, he has been oblivious of the fact that she has used such gifts and adulation in order to make the bond between them that much firmer, thus enabling her to possess him as the object of her passion. Consequently, he has become caught up in a whirlpool of events, not

---

[18] Wolf, op. cit., p. 49. Also Act I, scene 2, Werke I, 80.

least of which is the second invitation to the hunt, that make it extremely difficult for him to break off his alliance with Dido.

Against the better judgement of Achat, Aeneas decides to go on the hunt with Dido. Only Sergest and Ascan are to stay behind to look after the fleet; the rest of the princes are to join Aeneas on the hunt. He intends to inform Dido at that time about his impending departure - he wants to break the news to the queen slowly, in an attempt to cause her as little pain as possible. The motive for this is a mixed one; on the one hand sympathy for Dido's plight as a deserted lover and a recollection of their first love, and on the other fear of her rage when he informs her. Immediately following the hunt he intends to depart, for Aeneas has kept his fleet armed for battle under the pretext that Pygmalion was about to besiege the city.

In spite of the dramaturgical shortcomings in his characterization of Aeneas, Schlegel uses his character quite successfully to reflect the attractive nobility and devastating passion of Dido. Even before she appears on the scene, the reader already knows her as a passionate woman who will do everything in her power to keep her lover and also as a regal queen who in her beneficence welcomes strangers into the citizenship of Carthage. Consequently, "Dido tritt frei von dem konventionellen Ballast der Exposition und Selbstvorstellung in die Handlung ein."[19] The characterization of Aeneas, much as it is lacking in other respects, is therefore a key factor in the play in the sense that it expedites the plot and provides the necessary back-cloth for the portrayal of Dido, the tragic heroine and protagonist.

---

[19] Ibid.

When Dido appears (Act I, scene 4), her speech is quite straightforward and unpretentious. She is desperately torn by suspicions about Aeneas and had expected to confront him. Instead she meets Achat who informs her that Aeneas has just gone to summon his princes to the hunt. Concerned as she is as to what Aeneas is actually planning, she nevertheless wants Achat to prove all her suspicions unfounded. Without any ado, she comes right to the point: "Sprich, sorgt er für die Jagd? Wie? oder für die Flucht?/Fürwahr, der Tyrerkrieg schreckt ihn nicht ohne Frucht." (Act I, 4; Werke I, 84.) This important scene is dominated by impatience and mistrust. For Dido her suspicions have brought the problem to a head; she sees the issues as clear-cut and polarized - "so ist gewiß entdecket,/Ob Meineid oder Treu in seinem Herzen stecket." (Act I, 4; Werke I, 85) She refuses to recognise that it is a divine command that bids Aeneas leave Carthage; thus her determination to find out the truth about her lover, to get rid of or confirm nagging doubts once and for all, now becomes a relentless passion with her. For Dido there can be no "Pflicht und Neigung" conflict - all her actions are prompted by her passion and wounded pride; and her passions emerge with all their force in this scene. At first she is suspicious and bitter, later she is in despair and vindictive towards Aeneas and Achat. Dido becomes completely torn within - she thinks she knows what she wants, but all the time her suspicions tell her that this is not possible. Through the various tones of Dido's speech in this scene, Schlegel shows the reader her impulsiveness and inner state of tension. Initially, she is very argumentative, accusing and suspicious:

> Was hat er, wenn ihr nicht Betrug im Herzen traget,
> Erst diesen Augenblick zum Bitias gesaget?

Was rühmt er meine Huld? So rühmet kein Gemahl!
Was spricht er nun als Gast, wo er als Herr befahl?
Was wird so manches Wort von Schuld und Dank verloren?
Sein Herz ist ja der Dank, den er mir zugeschworen.[20]

The last line indicates Dido's desire to possess Aeneas - his heart is the expression of thanks that she requires. Dido needs Aeneas. Consequently, her suspicions aroused, she immediately jumps to the conclusion that she is a rejected woman, seeing the decision of the gods as a mere expedient means of helping Aeneas break his oath. She therefore probes, at first imploringly and with dignity:

Ists nicht wahr? er entflieht, und zählt zu seinen Siegen,
Den schwachen Ruhm, ein Weib durch Schwüre zu betriegen?
Laß nicht zu, daß dein Herr so eine That begeht,
Die Helden noch weit mehr, als andern, übel steht;
Und daß er seinen Ruhm durch eine Schuld beflecket,
Die keine Tapferkeit, kein Sieg, kein Lorbeer decket. (Act I, 4; Werke I, 84-5

Achat's reply is, however, non-committal. This stings Dido to a biting retort. With her suspicions are also her passions aroused, and this makes her on the one hand determined to find out the truth by whatever means she can, and on the other very prone to give vent to the tormenting tension that the uncertainty has created in her anguished soul; she becomes much more aggressive and this leads her to threaten Achat:

Gewiß hast du ihm selbst das Gift ins Herz geflößt,
Daß er mein Reich verschmäht und mich zurücke stößt.
Was läugnetest du sonst? Zerreiß nur unsre Bande;
Versenke mich in Gram, und ihn in Schimpf und Schande.
Schweig nur, verstelle dich! Doch, was Aeneas thut;
So wisse, daß die Schuld auf deinem Haupte ruht. (Act I, 4; Werke I, 85)

This scene between Achat and Dido produces tension and excitement for the reader; for Schlegel has already set in motion the slow but

---

[20] Act I, 4; Werke I, 84. It is interesting to note how quickly Schlegel's protagonist comes to the crucial issue. There is no exposition but action from the start.

steady decline in Dido's temperament that will, if not corrected, inevitably bring about her tragic disintegration as a person. Indeed, as Wolf rightly claims, all the elements that lead to the eventual catastrophe are present in this scene.

> Das Festlegen der ganzen Person auf einen Gedanken und einen Menschen; das Verkennen aller Maßstäbe und Vernunftgründe in der Wahl der Mittel; das Vergessen der eigenen Würde und Verantwortung. Alles Denken und Fühlen, alles Verhalten ist auf ein Entweder-Oder hin ausgerichtet. Meineid oder Treu, Trost oder Jammer.[21]

The news about Hiarbas and his threat to the city of Carthage, brought by Cloanth in the final scene of Act I, can only add to Dido's distress. She must now either marry this barbarian intruder or fight for her city. Achat, who is still present when the news is announced, fears that Aeneas may be tempted to delay his departure in order to help Dido in her predicament. Dido, however, is initially unconcerned about the problem of Hiarbas, she is still in desperate turmoil over Aeneas. She is almost convinced that he is about to desert her and yet her heart refuses to believe it; for she has seen through Aeneas' deceitful use of the threat to Carthage of Pygmalion, her brother, who she knows is now dead:

> Ja! er betrieget mich. Mein nagender Verdacht,
> Die Unruh, wie du sprachst, die ich mir selbst gemacht,
> Ist leider zu gerecht...
> Ach! Schwester, gab ich ihm mein Herz nur darum hin,
> Daß ich nun sehen soll, wie ich betrogen bin? (Act II, 1; Werke I, 87)

Dido's mind is overwhelmed and her honour feels slighted; she can only think in terms of falsehood, treachery and dishonour. Yet, although she

---

[21] Wolf, op. cit., p. 50.

feels offended, Dido is still conscious of her regal dignity. She is a noble queen and she will not be outthought by Aeneas, nor will she yield to him; her pride breaks through the pain: "Was wird er sich alsdann nicht über mich erkühnen?/Nein, wen ich nicht lieben kann, dem kann ich noch nicht dienen." (Act II, 1;, Werke I, 88)

The proud passion of Dido bursts forth in this scene with Anna. On the one hand she has a love for Aeneas; but on the other it is a love that must adhere to her terms. As a result, her suspicions cause her to burn with fiery condemnation of the very one she must possess. There seems only one way out for Dido - to kill Aeneas and herself, so as not to succumb to or be overcome by anyone. "Ihre Liebe ist keine natürliche Hingabe, sondern nur brennendes Verlangen;"[22] hence her thirst for revenge where rational love would have forced itself to swallow its injured pride. With this hint at a possible solution, Schlegel presents not only a probable curtailment of Dido's suffering but also gives us the yardstick by which her inner condition can be measured.[23] Anna indicates that Dido's turmoil is a consequence of her ravaging passion.

> Du hast ihn schon verdammt, und hast ihn nicht gehört...
> Dein Argwohn kommt aus dir. Daß du ihn frostig nennest,
> Macht er nicht, sondern du; weil du zu heftig brennest.
> (Act II, 1; Werke I, 88)

Her passion blinds her, however, to the fact that she may be judging Aeneas hastily. Moreover, it stubbornly causes her to justify herself; if her judgement of Aeneas is without foundation, then he is to blame,

---

[22] Wolf, op. cit., p. 51.

[23] Ibid.

not she, because his actions have given her cause to suspect him:

> Nein, er ist Schuld daran, wenn ich ihm Unrecht thu.
> Wenn er mich redlich liebt; was stört er meine Ruh?
> Hat Argwohn und Verdacht mich ohne Grund ergriffen?
> Wenn er nicht fliehen will; was sucht er bey den Schiffen?
> Nimmt man Geschäffte vor, indem man jagen soll?
> Sein Wesen droht Betrug, und ist geheimnißvoll. (Act II, 1; Werke I, 89)

Just as her passion bursts forth one moment with hatred and condemnation for Aeneas, so the next her desire to hold on to her lover re-asserts itself. She cries imploringly to the gods: "Ihr Götter, gebt doch nur, daß es ein Irrthum sey!/Ich selbst sey ungerecht; Aeneas sey getreu!" (Act II, 1; Werke I, 89)

The courageous and dignified composure with which Dido faces the threat of Hiarbas after Bitias has brought the news of an imminent attack (Act II, scene 2) instantaneously becomes a cauldron of furious emotions whenever she thinks of the prospect of being rejected by Aeneas. Her mind is plagued by the memory of Sichäus, her late husband; for, after Pygmalion, her brother, murdered him in their home in Tyre, she vowed never to love another man and to remain faithful to her husband's memory. In loving Aeneas, however, she has sacrificed the promise she made and her conscience is pricking her; for the very passion that she feels for Aeneas is truly a guilty one and virtue would demand that she stifle it.[24] Knowledge of this makes us judge Aeneas less harshly; for he is acting rationally and dutifully and Dido ought to do likewise. The threatened departure of Aeneas, however, far from reminding her of her duty, only serves to increase her sense of guilt. Gradually the memory of Sichäus begins to torment her mind with fear and almost tear her apart; rational thought is rapidly becoming a thing of the past with her.

---

[24] Heitner, op. cit., p. 92.

Hiarbas schreckt mich nicht; Aeneas lehrt mich zagen.
Ich, die Sichäens Tod und meine Flucht ertragen,
Ich fühle nun einmal der Schmerzen Raserey. (Act II, 3; Werke I, 91)

In her distraught state of mind Dido concludes that Aeneas is betraying her and that she must therefore defend herself.

Up till this point there has been no encounter between Aeneas and Dido; we merely see the effect of their relationship on each other as separate individuals. In the meeting between Dido and Aeneas in Act II, scene 4, there is, as a consequence, a sense of expectancy about how they will address each other. The apparent composure and indifference that issue forth in Dido's first words are nothing but a facade; her one aim is to find out once and for all where she stands with Aeneas.[25] Once this scene is over, Dido determines to avenge herself. In this respect it is a decisive scene for, with Dido's final attempt to prove her suspicions about Aeneas founded or unfounded and her consequent decision, the seeds of the tragic catastrophe are planted. Dido, the passionate tragic heroine, starts to put her plan for revenge into action: "Aeneas, dir hab ich was neues vorzutragen." (Act II, 4; Werke I, 93) Charlotte von Wymetal points out that this is indicative of a major break-through in German drama, claiming that, through the portrayal of passion in an aggressive heroine, Schlegel has brought dramatic action on to the German stage.[26] At a time when Gottsched's pedantic dramatic theory was still very influential, this is indeed a significant achievement on Schlegel's part. It is no less significant that this step forward was achieved through the characterization of a tragic heroine.

---

[25] Wolf, op. cit., p. 52.

[26] Wymetal, Charlotte von, "The hero and his opponent in the heroic tragedy from Gottsched to Lessing." Unpub. Diss (New Haven, 1954).

Dido wants Aeneas to prove his love for her by burning his fleet. For, as she clearly points out, the camouflage excuse that he had used no longer carries any weight; Pygmalion is dead. In the circumstances, therefore, Aeneas has no need to keep his fleet if he is not intending to be untrue. However, and this is not untypical of a determined, desperate woman whose driving passion must possess her lover, Dido wants Aeneas literally to burn his boats behind him - ostensibly to prove his love, but basically because, once he has done just that, Aeneas is in her power completely and utterly.

Aeneas is cornered. His hopes of breaking the news to Dido gently are dashed; he had not reckoned with the force in her that had originally captivated him - noble passion. In his own somewhat unconvincing way he attempts to say that he too is suffering for the gods are forcing him to go against the wishes of his own heart:

> Mein Herz ist dir geweiht, und wünscht, dich stets zu lieben:
> Der Himmel widerspricht und heißt mich dich betrüben...
> Und wahrlich, flieh ich dich, so flieh ich dich mit Schmerz!
> (Act II, 4; Werke I, 95)

Aeneas tries to point out that if he stays, the gods will not only punish him, but Dido as well; he would not, therefore, be favouring her by remaining in Carthage. However, his language in this scene indicates how far he has detached himself from Dido already. He speaks as one who has well prepared what he has to say; there is not even a hint of spontaneity. His speech does not come from the heart; indeed, all sense of feeling and emotion have been removed, producing an emasculated effect! He talks in terms of guilt and innocence, his thinking is rigidly polarized. The strictly antithetical nature of the alexandrines quoted above is evidence of such. Throughout the scene Aeneas' speech

adheres rigidly to this scheme; this is, however, dictated by the nature of his character and the limited scope for expression of Schlegel's dramaturgical ability.[27] In doing this Aeneas never achieves his purpose of communicating successfully the news of his departure to Dido. Indeed, his situation is never improved by the language he uses for the same arguments and illustrations keep on continually emerging. His speech is unconvincing because his thinking itself is rather narrow and lacking in discernment. In spite of this a sense of urgency can be detected in his speech from time to time, stemming largely from the desire on Aeneas' part to be convincing. In the main, however, his use of language shows that he is a captive of his situation and betrays his inability to see beyond the immediate problem.

In an effort to gain some response from a very cold, indifferent Aeneas, Dido had bitingly remarked that he was leaving now that he had amassed enough riches in her kingdom; but even this fails to arouse him. He merely protests that Dido is making Jupiter's command lie heavy on his heart. He tries in his limited way to explain the unenviable nature of his predicament - a conflict between his heart and the will of the gods - which is causing him terrible anguish. However, in spite of everything, he must decide to follow the gods: "Ja, Dido, ich will ziehn." (Act II, 4; Werke I, 95) With that, there can no longer be any doubt - nor can there be any hope! Dido therefore resorts to her plan to destroy Aeneas' ships, not merely to foil his intention to depart but moreover to drive him to respond in one way or another towards her, to compel him to end his indifference: "Ich will ihm wenigstens kein Mittel übrig lassen;/Er muß das äußerste, mich lieben oder

---

[27] Wolf, op. cit., p. 53.

hassen." (Act III, 2; Werke I, 104) This first meeting of Dido with Aeneas in Act II, scene 4, has therefore a decisive influence on the outcome of the play; for Dido becomes even more aggressive and she then determines to put her plan for revenge into action. Afterwards she storms off, intent on meeting the ambassadors of Hiarbas who are awaiting her in the temple, leaving Aeneas helplessly bewildered by her angry display.

In the meantime, Cloanth brings to Aeneas the news about Hiarbas and the impending attack, (Act II, scene 5). Aeneas decides to leave the town but, unknown to Dido, will not sail away until he knows that his former lover and queen is safe from the hands of this barbarian intruder. Throughout most of the play he never makes any progress towards his mission to re-found Troy; he is completely fettered by his situation in Carthage. His motives for leaving are indeed noble and legitimate; yet he does not act upon his decision to leave until the very end (Act V, scene 3) of the play.[28] Nor was that the intention or even within the scope of the dramatist. He is used by Schlegel to aid the unfolding of Dido's monstrous character[29] and her eventual disintegration as a person.

Dido, by comparison, continues to be led by her passion, and this now leads her into deceit. She pretends to agree to the departure of Aeneas in order to gain time in which to burn his ships: "Die Götter wissen es, mit welchem Zwang ich lüge;/Doch hab ich ihn beredt, Hiarbas sey mein Freund." (Act III, 2; Werke I, 104) Unfortunately, her prior outburst in Act III, scene 1, to Ascan and Cloanth about turning to Hiarbas for help could make a further meeting with Aeneas even more

---

[28] Werke I, 135. Anna brings an intimation that Aeneas has left.

[29] Wolf, op. cit., p. 53.

difficult than the first; it could indeed seriously handicap her chance of regaining Aeneas' interest in her, not as a defender but as a lover: "Ich fürchte keinen Streit, ich fürchte seine Flucht." (Act III, 2; Werke I, 104)

Dido's every word and action is now dictated by her passion for Aeneas. To Cloanth and Ascan, the servant and son of Aeneas respectively, she says in Act III, scene 1, that Hiarbas is now her friend and that she will accept his help in the defence of her kingdom. Rather predictably, she requires no help from Aeneas, a traitor. Ascan can hardly believe his ears. He finds it remarkable that Dido can now call someone her friend whom previously she hated. Her hinted friendship with Hiarbas is not, however, based on any affection she holds for him but rather on the intense hatred and bitter feeling of vengeance that she harbours against Aeneas: "Geh, sag es ihm, Cloanth. Er ist es nicht allein,/Der seine Schwüre bricht: auch ich kann untreu seyn!" (Act III, 1; Werke I, 101) This reaction on Dido's part is not a pretence, it is not prompted by her need to feign the role of an unrequited lover in front of Ascan and Cloanth so as to put her plan for revenge into action; rather it stems wholeheartedly from her genuine passion for Aeneas which will never accept his going away and therefore turns to hatred.[30] Unlike her plan to burn Aeneas' fleet, this outburst is not premeditated on Dido's part. In reacting in this way, she unwittingly paves the way for Aeneas to find out about her scheme of vengeance, whilst Schlegel uses the situation to further the course of the dramatic plot. For Ascan and Cloanth report this news to Aeneas and this prompts him later, against

---

[30] cf. Wolf, op. cit., p. 54. "Liebe wird zur Begierde und muß, unbefriedigt, in Haß umschlagen."

the better judgement of his servants, to adhere to Dido's plea to go and see her for a final time. His reason for meeting Dido one more time becomes clearer when we compare his remarks in Act IV, scene 1, with his present state of mind:

> Du liebst, wen du gehaßt, die Stadt aus Noth zu reissen;
> Und alles, ohne daß aus deinem Angesicht
> Ein Merkmaal deines Zwanges und deiner Schmerzen bricht.
> Ich schäme mich nunmehr, daß ich noch zweifeln können,
> Ob du dich selbst bezwingst, um dich von mir zu trennen.
> (Act IV, 1; Werke I, 115)

Aeneas had been concerned that Dido had not understood his dilemma; now his concern is that he does not understand hers! However, on the way to meeting Dido, Aeneas first of all confronts Hiarbas, from whom he hears of the queen's scheme to burn his fleet.

Dido's passion is evidenced throughout the whole of the scene with Ascan and Cloanth, Act III, scene 1. Ascan's attempts to defend Aeneas' absence by saying he fears that his presence would make the queen despair, are curtly dismissed by Dido. It is his conscience, she maintains, that is keeping him away from her, his conscience that constantly reminds him of his infidelity. Yet she implores Ascan to arrange for Aeneas to visit her on one last occasion in order to say good-bye. One minute she is filled with scorn for her lover, the next she refinds her tender feelings for him:

> Beleidigt bin ich zwar; jedoch ich kann verzeihn...
> Sprich weiter nichts zu ihm, als daß ihn Dido liebt,
> Und nur die Untreu haßt, die er an ihr verübt. (Werke, I, 102-103)

Bitias then brings the news that the inhabitants of Carthage are ready to fight for Dido. Dido tells Bitias how she has bestowed favours on Aeneas without any response on his part. And now that he wants to depart she instructs Bitias to take a group of citizens and burn his

fleet. Dido is here extremely calculating in her plan of revenge and she confidently predicts that the vacillating Aeneas will return to her after this show of force. Yet, even in this moment of cunning, she cannot hide her love for Aeneas:

> Noch heute will er fliehn, mit meinem Gut beladen.
> Doch will ich ihm noch nicht an seinem Leben schaden.
> Denn dazu, leider! ach! lieb ich ihn noch zu sehr!
> Sonst wär ich selbst genug und brauchte nicht ein Heer.
> Geh eiligst, Bitias, nimm, wen du kannst, zusammen.
> Verhindre seinen Rath, steck seine Schiff in Flammen.
> (Act III, 3; Werke I, 106)

In the meantime, Aeneas, expecting to meet Dido, unintentionally encounters Hiarbas, who scorns him for his alleged show of support for Dido. In his confused state of mind, Aeneas initially thinks that Dido has aligned herself with Hiarbas; he feels hurt that she has called him to her for a final visit only to hear the scorn of his rival. It is Cloanth who first questions the basis of Hiarbas' scorn, for Aeneas' departure should, to all intents and purposes, greatly please him. Achat and Cloanth both sense danger in the confusing statement of Hiarbas; they fear for Aeneas' life. Whilst Ascan is on the verge of avenging this insult, his father Aeneas is busy puzzling out the meaning of Hiarbas' words. He begins to suspect that Dido must have poisoned the mind of Hiarbas against him - particularly as his thoughts dwell on the news about his alleged burning of his own fleet. Aeneas' servants advise him to retreat to safety immediately, but he will not deliberately miss his arranged meeting with Dido on mere suspicion. However, he does send Ascan and Cloanth back to his ships in order to protect them, while Achat goes with him to confront Dido face to face.

Aeneas now meets Dido for the second time in Act IV, scene 1. Basically, however, Aeneas wants to know that he is leaving Dido and

that she is not deserting him. He is troubled by the report of Dido's outburst concerning Hiarbas and by the confusing confrontation he has just had with him. To Dido, however, his motive for seeing her appears to be one of merely justifying himself and satisfying his ego; for as soon as he sees that Dido still loves him, he wants to go, for time is short. Aeneas cannot spend too much time in Dido's presence, attempting to understand her position, because then his former feelings for her, which he has now conquered, would be re-kindled. Dido, however, does not see the situation in this light. To her his behaviour is nothing short of callous indifference and she desperately tries to cling on to Aeneas. To his comment that he ought to leave because his presence causes her so much pain, she makes a final, poignant appeal:

> Dein Abschied bringt mir Schmerz, nicht deine Gegenwart.
> Aeneas, bilde nur die Götter nicht so hart!
> Vielleicht verhindert noch ihr gütiges Geschicke
> Die Flucht, und meinen Tod, den ich im Geist erblicke.
> Sie haben dich geprüft, ob du gehorsam seyst,
> Dich deiner Lust beraubst, und ihre Schlüsse scheust;
> Jedoch sie werden auch auf meine Liebe sehen,
> Und deine Prüfung wird nicht mir zur Pein geschehen.
> (Act IV, 1; Werke I, 116)

Even this fails to elicit a change in Aeneas' response; he must obey the gods. The effect on Dido is devastating; she begins to lose control of her faculties.

4. Dido's disintegration: her speeches and use of language

After his second meeting with Dido in Act IV, scene 1, Aeneas never appears in the play again. Schlegel has intentionally designed the plot in this way so that in the final two Acts he can concentrate on the devastating effect that the loss of her love has on Dido's mind. We have seen in her relationship with Aeneas how Dido rejected the need

to control her emotions through reason and rational thought; now we see that she begins to lose all possibility of reaching a critical judgement of her situation, for she has thrown the yardstick of reason to the winds. In Vergil's version, Dido's downfall is more the arbitrary work of the gods. With Schlegel, we see the influence of the Enlightenment, for Dido's tragedy, indeed her total disintegration as a person, comes about as a result of her giving herself unrestrainedly to her passions. As the play proceeds we see more and more the far-reaching effects of Dido's action. Her speeches betray not only a disappointed, rejected and now irrational woman, but they also show us how far the process of human disintegration has advanced in her mind.

Towards the end of her first encounter with Aeneas in Act II, scene 4, Dido loses control of her rage when her lover tells her that there is no going back, he must obey the gods and leave Carthage. Although Aeneas is still present, it is as if he were not for he is completely ignored by Dido as she effuses a fiery condemnation of his behaviour to Anna, her confidante. Wolf categorizes this speech as falling into three distinct stages.[31] At first Dido, composed and under control, adopts a distanced effect, acting as if Aeneas is not even there; she does not address herself to him, she merely mocks his arguments with bitter irony. Then suddenly her mood and expression change to the very opposite and an uncontrollable, passionate outburst shatters her composure and threatens to deluge Aeneas. In the third stage, the tone of the speech becomes calmer once again, and Dido regains her distance to Aeneas. Schlegel uses this speech to show us just how suddenly Dido can lose control of her passions and how rapidly she can,

---

[31]Wolf, op. cit., p. 56.

at this stage in the play, regain her composure once her emotional tension has been discharged.

The speech starts with Dido's polarized concepts: either Aeneas loves her or he does not, he is either faithful or disloyal, true or unfaithful:

> Nun, meine Schwester, sieh! so hält er seine Pflicht;
> Sein Herz ist ohne Falsch und Untreu kennt er nicht.
> Sieh, wie er itzo noch nur Treu im Munde führet,
> Und wie sein Meyneid selbst nur von den Göttern rühret. -
> (Act II, 4; Werke I, 96)

This has the ring of a judge addressing a defendant; Dido's referring to Aeneas in the third person, combined with the informal imperative with which she addresses Anna, only serves to increase this feeling of distance. In an instant this atmosphere is shattered:

> Dich, Lügner, hat kein Gott, zum Lohn der Frömmigkeit,
> Aus Brand und See geführt und von Gefahr befreyt;
> Das Schwerd hat, mir zum Gram, den Falschesten verschonet,
> Der in der Dardaner verlognen Stadt gewohnet!
> Verräther! Hätt ein Sturm durch aller Winde Macht,
> Den Rest von Trojens Brand im Wasser umgebracht;
> Hätt eine Welle dich an einen Fels geschmissen;
> So dürft ich nichts von dir und deiner Untreu wissen.
> Ja, fleuch nur! Es ist Zeit. Die Schiffe sind nunmehr
> Vom Reichthum Lybiens und meinem Wohlthun schwer,
> Und dein verschmachtet Volk ist satt von meinen Gaben.
> Du hast, was du begehrt, - dies, Falscher, wolltst du haben!
> Was denkest du daran, ob Dido sich betrübt,
> Die deiner Untreu flucht, und dich noch unwerth liebt?
> Was fragt dein steinern Herz nach eines Weibes Thränen?
> Du lachest, wenn ich dich mit Seufzen muß erwähnen. -
> Herz, das kein Mitleid fühlt! Unbändge Tigerzucht!
> Wär ich so hart, als du, so sollte deiner Flucht
> Ein Stahl schon Einhalt thun. Der sollt, in meinen Händen,
> Die Bosheit deiner Brust bestrafen, und auch enden.
> Dann würde noch mein Geist auf seiner Flucht ergötzt,
> Wenn eben das Gewehr, das deine Brust verletzt,
> Auch ihn, von Rache satt, von seinem Körper trennte;
> Wenn ich auf deinen Leib noch sterbend fallen könnte.
> Wie freudig würde dann mein trübes Auge sehn,
> Wie dir der Geist entflöh, da dir dein Recht geschehn!
> O Anblick! wenn sodann mit meines Blutes Strömen,
> Die Ströme deines Bluts sich zu vermischen kämen! (Act II, 4; Werke I, 96)

The eighteenth century German reader, schooled in French classical tragedy with all its refinements, must have recoiled with shock on first hearing such strong, garish language coming from the protagonist of a drama. Dido decries the character of Aeneas, using such expressions as "Lügner," "Verräther," "unbändge Tigerzucht!," "Falscher." This effect is increased by the powerful imagery and imprecations that follow: 6 "Aus Brand und See geführt," 9, 10, 11 and 12 "Hätt ein Sturm durch aller Winde Macht,/Den Rest von Trojens Brand im Wasser umgebracht;/Hätt eine Welle dich an einen Fels geschmissen;/So dürft ich nichts von dir und deine Untreu wissen." 28 "Wenn ich auf deinen Leib noch sterbend fallen könnte." 31 and 32 "O Anblick! wenn sodann mit meines Blutes Strömen,/Die Ströme deines Bluts sich zu vermischen kämen." In all of these bold expressions Dido jumps rapidly from her own wishes and desires to scorn, accusation and vituperation of Aeneas, and vice-versa. Her speech proceeds at a furious rate; it is staccato in character, shifting quickly from one emphasis to another.

Schlegel manifests an accomplished sense of the dramatic in producing this effect in Dido's speech. The apparent calm is unexpectedly shattered by line 5; this is achieved through the strongly emphatic tone, which contrasts with the iambic rhythm used at the beginning of the line. Further, the typically two-fold conceptualization of the alexandrine in line 6 - "aus Brand und See geführt/und von Gefahr befreyt," - where the thought is expressed first in a concrete and then in an abstract fashion, contributes immensely to the intensity of Dido's language. Lines 9/10, 11/12, are used by Schlegel to reinforce Dido's accusation and grievance in line 5. Like line 6, these four lines can be broken down into two different yet connected parts; moreover, Schlegel again uses short, monosyllabic words to increase the reinforcement effect,

thus cultivating a sense of tense expectancy in the mind of the reader. These four lines also make a significant contribution in their content; curses are hurled at Aeneas, and yet they do not seem so horrific to the eighteenth century reader since they stem from the mouth of a noble heroine and because the object of her curses is also the object of her love. Both the expressions - "im Wasser umgebracht" and "an einen Fels geschmissen" - are ignoble and base, and belong to those kind of expressions which, on account of their low-minded vulgarity, Gottsched recommended should only be used occasionally in drama. Gottsched, himself, however, made quite frequent use of similar expressions in his plays; but with Schlegel their effect is not that successful.[32] Nevertheless, through shrewd use of the tragic heroine, Schlegel has effected a progressive change; he succeeds in bringing into the language of German drama that which Gottsched had disdainfully termed "die natürliche Derbheit."[33]

Lines 13, 14 change the tone; one can detect Dido's injured pride coming through behind the apparent scorn. Line 14 evidences the characteristic repetition of the alexandrine, while the frequent use of short sentences and exclamation marks help to indicate the state of excitement in which Dido now finds herself. In line 16 Dido withdraws somewhat through a use of irony; with that comes a certain detachment which gives the reader respite from her inner turbulence. However, this effect is removed even before the end of the line when Dido harangues Aeneas once again with the term "Falscher!"

Lines 17, 18 register a further change in the tone of Dido's speech; scorn suddenly becomes an angry accusation. Line 17 is a well

---

[32] Wolf, op. cit., p. 57.

[33] Wolf, op. cit.

used elegiac cliché; Dido refers to herself in the third person, showing that even her own fate has become the object of her anger. Lines 19, 20 serve as the alexandrine reinforcement of this turning to anger on Dido's part.

In line 21 Dido's air of scornful detachment is dropped completely and her inner turmoil boils over. For the first time in this speech, Schlegel does not allow Dido to use a fully-fledged sentence. The expression "unbändge Tigerzucht" is the crowning blow of alienating Aeneas; only someone who is beside herself could say such a thing to the person she loves. Wolf[34] points out that Schlegel was here drawing on the powerful imagery used by Vergil in his version: "Dich aus hartem Granit! Dich säugten hyrkanische Tiger."[35] This effect is continued throughout the remaining lines of the second part of this speech (lines 22-32); for Schlegel emphasises not so much the noisy, somewhat pathetic figure of Dido but rather the portentous horror contained in her thoughts and expressions. He shows us the beginnings of a sick mind seething with anger, effusing a description of fantastic and inhuman behaviour. Dido's vociferation, however, hardly has any relevance to the very person she is addressing, Aeneas. She no longer talks with him; she has begun to talk past him. Schlegel uses this extremely modern ploy to portray the mental agony that Dido is suffering as a result of her unbridled passions. The climax is reached in lines 31, 32 with her wish to see the blood streaming from Aeneas' body mingling with the blood coming from her own mortal wound.

---

[34] Wolf, op. cit., p. 58.

[35] Vergil, Aeneis, transl. by W. Plankl (Stuttgart, 1959), p. 94, line 367.

Suddenly, Dido regains the distance that she had in the first part of this speech, once again she appears like a judge addressing a defendant:

> Doch, Falscher! lebe nur und irre durch die Welt:
> So lang es der Geduld der Götter noch gefällt;
> Die du von deiner That zu Mitgenossen machest,
> Im Munde heilig nennst, im Herzen kühn verlachest!
> Dein Schutz, dein Jupiter, ist mehr geschimpft, als ich,
> Der strafe, wo er will, und räche sich und mich!
> (Act II, 4; Werke I, 96-97)

In the end Dido has the strength to compose herself and control her passions; in such a light her outburst appears as a momentary deviation from her usually noble character, which comes through in the last lines particularly. Dido evidences a rational calm, ending with the promulgation that Jupiter will one day avenge himself for this misrepresentation and vindicate Dido. The result of this change in Dido is that she veers away from any notion of a heroic double-death with Aeneas and resorts instead to her criminal plan to burn his fleet. In this way Schlegel makes use of an aspect of Vergil's symbolism; for Dido's desire to satisfy a subconscious need in her for slaughter and murder through the spectacle of the sea aflame with burning ships, is akin to Nero's "Hybris."[36] Moreover, this spectacle of fire has a double meaning for Dido; in a literal sense, the flames will realise her revenge, but figuratively speaking, they represent the raging fire of love for Aeneas that burns within her breast.

> Komm, Schwester, laß uns gehn,
> Und sehn, wie Schiff und Mast in vollen Flammen stehn.
> Dies Schauspiel bringt mir Lust. (Act IV, 2; Werke I, 119)

---

[36] Wolf, op. cit., p. 61.

Dido's sickness of mind becomes a reality with these words, for they could only be spoken by a monster. It would only need her intrigue to fail and her mind would snap completely.

With her mind already subject to considerable strain, the threatened departure of Aeneas brings back the memory of her sacrificing her promise of eternal faithfulness to her late husband, so that she could be free to love Aeneas. This memory torments her mind with fear and almost tears her soul apart. Why? Ostensibly, Dido is truly dreading Aeneas' departure; she cannot stand the thought of losing him. Essentially, however, Dido is deeply afraid of her own fiery, passionate nature; the nature that at one time can swear on oath her eternal faithfulness to the memory of Sichäus and, at another time, break that very oath in order to give herself the present object of her passionate desire, Aeneas.

> Ach! leider, dieses Herz, das jener [Sichäus] so geliebt,
> Hat ein Verräther itzt, der mich mit Lust betrübt....
> Ich bin es, die da schwur; auch kalt, verbrannt, begraben,
> Sollst du, Sichäus, mich und meine Liebe haben.
> Ach! warum hielt ichs nicht? (Act II, 4; Werke I, 91-92)

In her present state of mind, the breaking of her vow takes on added significance for her; it is as if she killed her late husband because she has loved another man. Unfortunately for Dido, this process is a circular one and such rigorous self-examination only increases the strain on her mind and evidences the encroaching straits of dementia. She now begins to think that Aeneas' departure is the gods' reward for her faithlessness; her mind is becoming distraught. Anna conveys to us the state of Dido's mind: "Du quälest deinen Geist durch selbsterdachten Schmerz." (Act II, 4; Werke I, 91)

Dido makes one final attempt to win Aeneas in Act IV, scene 1, their second meeting. After she has implored him in a most impassioned way to

return to her with the promise that all will be forgiven, Aeneas' reply is, for Dido, one of absolute rejection; for he must nevertheless obey the command of the gods. He implores her to accept their ruling too: "Ach, Dido, hoffe doch auf solche Götter nicht!/Die Hülfe, die du hast, ist: Meide mein Gesicht!" (Act IV, scene 1; Werke I, 116) Aeneas can only think of the wind that is rising along the shore; this, he concludes favourably, is a sign of the gods calling him to obey their dictate.

Dido cannot contain her anger. With frenzied haste she blurts out that Aeneas has been deceived and his ships set on fire, thus confirming the suspicions raised in Aeneas' mind by his meeting with Hiarbas. Aeneas is deeply hurt by this treachery on Dido's part. Dido equally forcefully points out that Aeneas' behaviour is treacherous to the extent that it is likely to kill her; he can tell her of his departure so coldly, without showing the slightest feeling for the intensity of the passionate love he is rejecting. In her desperation Dido valiantly attempts to make Aeneas stay - she has deceived him and burnt his fleet but only so that he would stay and accept from Dido her love and her throne: "Ich raube dir durch List ein ungewisses Reich,/ Und mache den Verlust mit meiner Krone gleich." (Act IV, 1; Werke I, 117)

Aeneas greets this with a stony silence. The effect on Dido is devastating. She bursts forth with a furious malignity which betrays that her mind is suffering under the strain. She imagines that both Aeneas and Hiarbas are against her. In her desolate affliction she goads Aeneas to kill her before she does it herself: "Erwähle, was du willst; lieb oder tödte mich!" (Act IV, 1; Werke I, 118)

Once more Dido has offered Aeneas her hand in the hope that he will forgive her outbursts and renew his relationship with her. Aeneas,

however, meets this offer with a cool silence that injures Dido's pride and self-respect; the fact that even this has failed to move Aeneas, leaves her in a deeper despair and frustration.[37]

Charlotte von Wymetal maintains that, through allowing such a rapid change of heart to take place in the heroine, i.e., from passionate love to her calculated plan of revenge and vice-versa, Schlegel has failed to convince us of Dido's authenticity as a character. Her threats have hardly died away, she argues, when she is coldly deliberating on a plan of revenge.[38] This is, however, a misunderstanding of the intense variety of emotions that the human heart is capable of experiencing. It is possible for a human (a cynic would be tempted here to add, particularly a female!) to experience the height of burning passion one minute, and, should this not be satisfied in its desires, for this to change into a cold, calculating hatred the next.[39] There is, therefore, a special significance that lies behind Schlegel's portrayal of Dido in this way; namely, that unrequited passion becomes a calculating hatred, which in turn leads to a thirst for revenge and therefore brings action, albeit slowly, into the play.

---

[37]There is a distinct similarity between this scene and the scene in Schiller's Maria Stuart where the heroine, Maria, meets her distant relative and arch-rival, Queen Elizabeth, in the garden of a park. For Maria, on whose behalf this meeting was initiated, this was an honest and sincere attempt to reconcile the differences that came between them. However, her initial tender affection, coldly rebuffed by Elizabeth, turns to a catastrophic outburst of passion where she vents all her anger and spite on the person who has imprisoned her; this violent outburst of despair seals her doom.

[38]Wymetal, op. cit., p. 159.

[39]cf. Wolf, op. cit., p. 54, whose understanding of the passionate human heart is far more basic: "Liebe wird zur Begierde und muß, unbefriedigt, in Haß umschlagen."

In the course of the fourth Act we see Dido's inner sickness reach its peak. She cannot comprehend Aeneas' indifference. She does not stop to ask why he is indifferent - she merely bemoans her misfortune that he is not responding. Her determination increases: "Wenn sich sein Sinn nicht beugt, so werd er dann gebrochen!" (Act IV, 2; Werke I, 118) Yet her supposing that Aeneas no longer loves her, together with the nagging uncertainty as to whether he ever has done that accompanies such a presumption, drives Dido to despair:

> Ich ließ ihn willig ziehn, hätt er mir nichts versprochen;
> Hätt er, als meine Hand ihm Kron und Zepter gab,
> Gesagt: Behalt sie dir, der Himmel hält mich ab!
> Doch da ers nun verschmäht, auf meinem Thron zu sitzen,
> Und seinem Meyneid dünkt die Götter vorzuschützen;
> So richt: Ist es zu viel, wenn mein gerechter Schmerz,
> Zur Lindrung, Rache sucht, und mein verzweifelnd Herz
> Den, der durch Untreu mich bis zur Verzweiflung kränket,
> Durch kühne List mit sich ins Grab zu ziehen denket?
> (Act IV, 2; Werke I, 118-119)

Her unrequited passion causes her thoughts to become desperate; under the weight of an indulgent self-pity, her mind ceases to perceive her situation in a reasoning and rational fashion but begins rather to rationalize and justify her own desires; as a consequence, she is considering killing Aeneas and herself, for she finds such a heroic revenge satisfying.

Anna reproaches Dido for following her feelings far too much; she reminds her that she has a duty to her subjects:

> Ach Schwester! Furcht und Angst rührt den besorgten Geist,
> Wenn dein gepeinigt Herz mir seine Schlüsse weist.
> Du folgest allzusehr der Regung deiner Seelen,
> Und lässest dich dein Herz nach eignem Willen quälen.
> Denk itzt an deine Stadt. (Act IV, 2; Werke I, 119)

She should despisedly forget Aeneas and carry out her duty to her subjects.

Nevertheless, Dido goes on insisting that the gods are not in favour of Aeneas' departure. Clearly, her passion is obscuring her reason. Yet Dido cannot help herself; she cannot despise Aeneas and forget all about him, for then she would be despising her own heart. Even at this point, therefore, she determines to cling on to Aeneas in an attempt to break his coldness of heart.

When Bitias, her general, appears with the news that the attempt to set Aeneas' fleet on fire has been foiled, Dido's fury is unrelenting: "Feig und verzagtes Volk! Ein Flüchtling kann euch schrecken?/Und eure Königinn laßt ihr in Schande stecken?" (Act IV, 3; Werke I, 121) Bitias excuses himself for failing in this task because heaven was protecting Aeneas' ships. Dido retorts: "Nur eure Trägheit ist die Gottheit, die sie schützet." (Ibid.)

Dido's despairing soul is laid bare once more. In her despair she discovers a spiritual law that is often applicable to personal relationships - that the way in which one behaves towards others will, if not immediately, eventually be the manner in which one is treated by others.[40]

> Ich fluche seinem Haupt und kann ihm selbst nichts thun;
> Wo nicht mein Schatten sich der Höllen einst entreisset,
> Und ihn durch tausend Qual lehrt, was ein Meyneid heißet,
> Und Pluto mir vergönnt, daß die, so Eid und Pflicht
> An dem Sichäus brach, der Höllen Thor durchbricht,
> Und andrer Untreu straft. (Act IV, 4; Werke I, 121-122)

Dido broke her oath and duty to Sichäus, her late husband, and now Aeneas

---

[40] cf. Galatians ch. 6 verse 7, in the Revised Standard Version Bible: "Whatever a man sows, that he will also reap." The latest writings of psychologists on "Transactional Analysis," e.g., Harris, I'm okay, you're okay (New York, 1967) indicate a substantial degree of agreement with this principle. However, they do not take the matter as far as this spiritual law does; but what they do maintain is that if one person treats another as a child and not as an adult, then that person will respond by treating him in the very same way.

is breaking his promise to her. It is a significant aspect of Schlegel's modernity that such a discovery is made by the heroine when her mind is bordering on insanity; for only then is she sufficiently detached from the game of life with all its social pressure towards conformity to perceive accurately the implications of the role she has been playing. Dido, however, is now far beyond the distress that such a realisation would cause; her mind is rapidly becoming demented for she is now tormented by the apparition of Sichäus. Whilst Anna tries to calm her, Dido can vividly see the ghost of her late husband. Her mind is under severe strain; not merely because of the loss of Aeneas, but moreover because of her indecision in the present crisis. She does not know what to do and her mind betrays this desperate insecurity in her frantic questioning of Sichäus' ghost. The torment and mental anguish that Dido evidences in Act IV, scene 4 suggests that her mind is near to breaking-point - such is the reaction in a full-blooded, passionate nature that fails to procure the object of its desire.

The realization that Aeneas has found out about her scheme to burn his ships, resulting in her failure to gain revenge on him, has therefore brought an even greater despair on Dido; it is despair over her inability to carry out her plan, her consequent rage against Aeneas, and her hatred for him, which is, however, tinged with desire and regret. While she is in this distraught state of mind, her captain comes to inform her that Hiarbas' army is approaching. This heaps coals on the fire already raging in her mind: "Mein Schmerz hat allen Rath aus meiner Brust gerissen./O Schwester, gieb du Rath, und sprich: was soll ich thun?" (Act IV, 4; Werke I, 123)

Anna admonishes her to keep calm; courage can overcome the grief of rejection that she bears. She tells Dido to forget her love, her hatred,

her desire for revenge, for they will not now find their expression; and as such they will only cause her more pain if she dwells on them. She cannot hurt Aeneas now that he has gone; she will only hurt herself. Anna's attempts to advise Dido in this balanced, rational way come to nought, for the state of derangement in Dido's mind is far too advanced. Moreover, Dido's qualms of conscience have led her further into hallucination; for it is this that caused her to see the vision of her late husband's ghost. And yet, far from making her give up her love for Aeneas, as the rational person would, this apparition fills her with guilty despair and thoughts of suicide. In her desperation she sees death as the one action that will torment Aeneas. This is indeed an indication that her mind has snapped, for she earnestly believes that her ghost will haunt and plague Aeneas, as her late husband's has done to her. Anna realises Dido's state of mind: "Ach! wer erweckt in dir dies rasende Beginnen?" (Act IV, 6; Werke I, 125)

The failure of her intrigue and the prospect of an imminent death by suicide have caused Dido to lose control of her mind - "das Endstadium der Krankheit ist erreicht"[41] - and in Act IV, scene 6, she rejoins with an irrational outburst of the utmost intensity. She is despondent over her own powerlessness to do anything to Aeneas now, she is furious that he has triumphed, and all the hate, desire, vengeance and regret that she holds pours forth during this significant monologue. Dido "no longer cares whether her purpose is rational or virtuous,"[42] she is "mehr das Gefäß des Wahnsinns."[43]

---

[41] Wolf, op. cit., p. 62.

[42] Heitner, op. cit., p. 93.

[43] Wolf, op. cit.

Es herrsche, was da will, in den betäubten Sinnen;
Es führe hier der Zug des Himmels meinen Geist;
Es sey der Höllen Trieb, der mich von hinnen reißt,
Der Furien Geheiß, die meinen Schatten winken;
Es heiße mich ein Schluß in ihre Klüfte sinken,
Den die Vernunft bedacht, und meine Brust gefaßt:
So steht mein Vorsatz fest. Ich lebe mir zur Last.
(Act IV, 6; Werke I, 125)

She feels possessed by daemonic powers that have deranged her and are now calling her to her death. The situation in which she now finds herself is too much for her - all sense of reason vanishes and is replaced by incoherent frenzy:

Aeneas spottet mein, gesichert in den Wellen.
Hiarben darf ich kaum mein Volk entgegen stellen.
Sichäus ist erzürnt; sein Schatten quälet mich.
Mein Kummer ruft mir zu und spricht: Erlöse dich! -
Ich aber säume noch? - Mein Muth hat mich verlassen,
Und der zerstreute Geist vermag sich kaum zu fassen.
(Act IV, 6; Werke I, 125)

In her confused, demented state, Dido begins to welcome death as the only way of escape from her utterly hopeless situation:

Ich sollte todt und kalt an Lethens Ufer seyn, -
Und sehe lebend noch des Lichtes verhaßten Schein?
Ich streite noch um das, was ich schon längst beschlossen? -
O hätte dieser Dolch Aenears Blut vergossen,
Und des Betrügers Herz gestraft, wie er gesollt!
Drum führt ich ihm bey mir, und dies hab ich gewollt.
Doch schläfrig, träg und faul hab ich zu sehr geschonet;
Mein Schimpf ist unbestraft, sein Meyneid unbelohnet.
(Act IV, 6; Werke I, 125)

With an impassioned plea to her subjects to hunt down Aeneas and rout his army, Dido determines to kill herself, so that her ghost can pursue Aeneas in delirious hallucinations, just as she has had to endure from Sichäus, and drive him to his own suicide:

Wohl, ich geh ihm voran! Doch schwör ich, daß mein Geist
Nicht eh sich in der Schaar beglückter Seelen weist,

Bis des Verräthers Brust, wenn ihn mein Schatten quälet,
Ein kühner Stoß, wie mich, von eigner Hand entseelet.
Ihr Bürger, schifft ihm nach, verfolgt ihn durch das Meer,
Schlagt in Italien sein Volk durch euer Heer!
Ihr Kinder, geht dereinst, verlöscht der Väter Schande,
Schlagt, was sich von ihm nennt, in seinem eignen Lande!
Damit er sich nicht rühmt, daß er in eurer Stadt,
Und unter eurem Dach euch überwunden hat.
Wohlan...[44]

This long outburst of Dido's is one of the most important speeches in the play, for in it Schlegel shows us the state of near madness that the heroine's passionate nature has brought upon her. It is a passionate outburst of the highest intensity, against the world, against Aeneas, and notwithstanding, against herself. Emil Staiger calls it "eine Raserei,"[45] and Wolf aptly describes it as "das zerstörerische Rasen eines kranken Gemüts."[46] This speech provides an accurate depiction of Dido's passion and suffering. Using short, impulsive sentences and powerful imagery, Schlegel gives a realistic picture of the heroine's excited but crippled mind. In the same scene, Act IV, 6, Dido defends the right to end her own life; she justifies suicide as her only means of satisfaction for her bitter desire of revenge; further, suicide becomes her only way of escape from the shame her honour has suffered. In the final analysis, however, it is the grief she has suffered at the loss of her lover that justifies her attempt to find solace in death.

---

[44] Act IV, 6; Werke I, 125-126. Lines 26 - 31 are a prophetic reference to Hannibal and the Punic Wars of the second century B.C.

[45] Staiger, Emil, "Rasende Weiber in der deutschen Tragödie des 18. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zum Problem des Stilwandels." Stilwandel (Zürich, 1963), 25 - 74, p. 33.

[46] Wolf, op. cit., p. 62.

In the strictly Gottschedian sense,[47] this speech is an unqualified imitation of nature. Vergil's portrayal of the disquietened Dido is, in fact, the natural object that Schlegel is trying to imitate; but more than that, Vergil's depiction was the very inspiration that caused Schlegel to write this drama.[48] It is in this scene that the direct influence of Vergil's character portrayal becomes apparent. The very tone and atmosphere bespeak the lines in Vergil's version that Dido utters upon discovering the secret departure of Aeneas. In Schlegel, as in Vergil, the overwhelming assumption that guides Dido's thoughts is that all is now lost; the content of this speech in both versions constantly fluctuates between curses hurled at Aeneas and feelings of regret, hatred and self-pity in Dido herself. Certain elements of Vergil's version appear directly in Schlegel's; indeed, Schlegel has presented a scene that differs so little from the original that Wolf maintains that he has achieved an exemplary imitation of nature.[49] He not only re-creates the same atmosphere as Vergil but even uses his thoughts and imagery.

The tone of this speech makes it stand out from the rest of the scene, for it does show us Dido at the end of her tether, as it were. However, it also indicates how Schlegel was somewhat lacking in the ability to produce this dramatic effect in a natural, unmechanical way.

---

[47] cf. Critische Dichtkunst, p. 90: "Diese Nachahmung der Poeten nun geschieht vermittelst einer sehr lebhaften Beschreibung, oder gar lebendigen Vorstellung desjenigen, was sie nachahmen." and p. 360: "Er [der Dichter] ist nicht zufrieden, daß die Worte mit den Begriffen übereinstimmen, sondern er strebt nach was vollkommenerm und macht die Schreibart der Sache so ähnlich, daß man die Sache selbst zu sehen glaubt."

[48] Wolf, op. cit., p. 63.

[49] Ibid. This would, of course, be only in the Gottschedian sense.

This is due in part to the rigid form of the alexandrine which tends to create a mechanical effect. Yet the content in the first 21 lines of this speech by Dido produces more an effect of self-examination and an analysis of her situation, than one of natural, spontaneous expression from a distraught person.[50] It is as if Dido has detached herself from her own situation and feelings, and has begun to look at them through the eyes of an outside observer. This effect is even more marked in the version that Gottsched uses in the text of Deutsche Schaubühne. Instead of the question-marks, there are, without exception, full-stops. Schlegel later inserted the question-marks in an effort to depict the confused delusion that is present in Dido's mind. But even with this insertion, he is still not entirely successful, for Schlegel looks at his heroine and his portrayal of her through the eyes of his own rational mind. He has not succeeded in penetrating into the living condition of an irrational mind but rather has analysed the situation from a protective distance without involving himself in Dido's role. As a consequence, Dido expresses those things that a detached observer would attribute to and project onto a person bordering on insanity, "und ebenso tritt sie selten ihrer eigenen Raserei gegenüber."[51]

Close analysis of her speech shows that it is constructed with a logical sequence of thought. At the beginning Dido uses emotive phrases in an attempt to describe what is happening inside her mind. These outcries contain an immense rhetorical bombast that releases the heroine's feelings and emotions; they culminate in the statement - "So steht mein

---

[50] Staiger, op. cit., p. 33.

[51] Staiger, op. cit.

Vorsatz fest." (line 7) Schlegel draws on every possibility, even the forces of heaven and hell, to emphasise the immensity of Dido's pain and to make her decision more credible.

After this introductory stage, where the subjunctive mood of the verb is much used, there follow five lines of short, straightforward sentences, containing no subordinate clauses. These systematically convey the reasons for Dido's decision and the causes of her lamentable suffering. Even at this point, where Dido is supposed to be no longer in control of her faculties, she appears somewhat rational in the way she perpends her grounds for suicide; it is almost as if she had to justify her decision to herself and convince the reader of its worth. During this time of reflection she is essentially detached from her situation, a point that becomes more evident when we hear line 11 - "Mein Kummer ruft mir zu und spricht: Erlöse dich!" Even the next line - "Ich aber säume noch?" is not so much a product of her emotional condition as it is a judgement of her behaviour. The whole tone of the first part of her speech is made up of coherent reflections rather than emotional utterances.

Dido attempts to classify what is taking place inside her, but without success, for she does not know which thought or action is dominant within her; Schlegel realises that an irrational person no longer has this discerning ability. However, although Dido does not have this perception, she still evidences the methods of rational psychology in her self-examination, and it is because of this concentration of the heroine's thought patterns on her own self in an attempt to understand her situation and the varied feelings and actions that it excites, that Staiger contends

that Schlegel's required dramatic effect falls apart.[52] For the reader does not so much perceive the effect of turmoil and dementia from the heroine's use of language but rather hears it directly from the lips of Dido herself: line 1 - "in den betäubten Sinnen," line 2 - "Es führe hier der Zug des Himmels," line 3 - "Es sey der Höllen Trieb," lines 5; 6 - "ein Schluß.../Den die Vernunft bedacht und meine Brust gefaßt," line 11 - "Mein Kummer ruft mir zu," line 12 - "Mein Muth hat mich verlassen," line 13 - "Und der zerstreute Geist vermag sich kaum zu fassen."

With line 22 - "Wohl, ich geh ihm voran!" - Dido breaks from her reflecting on her situation into a resolute expression of her intention. And yet this is only a temporary departure, for her very next sentence betrays a process of thinking things through: "daß mein Geist/Nicht eh sich in der Schaar beglückter Seelen weist." (line 23-24) Here we have once again the impression of Dido acting as a commentator on her own position.

Nowhere in this speech does Schlegel make use of a different metre; he adheres rigidly to the alexandrine with its doubling of expression. As a result, the speech seems highly structured in content and form, and never do we have the impression of a heroine completely and utterly in the throes of her passion. It is on this basis that Wolf contends that the picture of passion presented in this speech has a quite harmless effect on the reader, for Schlegel never departs from the conventions of the time.[53] If the dramatist felt he could touch the hearts of the

---

[52] Ibid.

[53] Wolf, op. cit., p. 64.

reader with these lines, then he must have been convinced that the only access to the heart was via the mind and understanding.[54] The use of language in this speech remains a product of the dramatist; never does it become the property and possession of the speaker, Dido. Her lines lack a pulsating rhythm, and there is no effective use made of the "Zäsur" and of contrast between images and thoughts in the rhyme.[55] This is not to imply, however, that Schlegel has failed in his portrayal of the irrational in Dido; rather it is to say that, although his ideas for characterization were modern, he was, in his methods of character portrayal, still to a considerable degree a prisoner of the Gottschedian rationalist environment where reason had to be seen to triumph over the lower domain of man, over his passions, his feelings and his desires.

This may seem somewhat harsh on Schlegel as a dramatist, for within those same confines of Gottschedian tragedy this speech is very well constructed and, using the limited resources and expressions that the conventions allowed him, he has succeeded in evoking the aura of a distraught woman. What this speech does indicate is the ambitiousness of Schlegel; for he is attempting a task that was far beyond his language and scope as a dramatist at that time, i.e., that of portraying an inner condition of mental disintegration in the person of the heroine. In spite of the shortcomings in his dramatization, nothing can detract from the immensity and, indeed, the modernity of the task he set himself.

To the eighteenth century reader, immersed in the rationalistic environment, this speech was, without doubt, a convincing imitation of nature; for they saw her pain and limitless passion as a realistic

---

[54] Ibid.

[55] Staiger, op. cit., p. 35.

depiction of a character who is not controlled by reason. Anna is likewise convinced; she is distressed by this remarkable burst of rage and demands to know Dido's intention with the dagger. Dido's desperation now pours forth in all its pathos:

> Ach! laß mir diesen Stahl...
> Mißgönne meiner Brust dies werthe Werkzeug nicht,
> Das diesmal mir allein erwünschten Trost verspricht.
> (Act IV, 6; Werke I, 126)

Anna reminds her of her former bravery and dignity as queen and her duty now to her subjects. Can she leave to their own fate those citizens who have stood by her as she has fought barbarians in the past? If Dido committed suicide, then any fight against Hiarbas would lose its purpose, for the citizens would have no queen to protect. Anna is quite forceful in her reprimand: "Ich will, daß dieser Stahl eh meine Brust durchsticht, / Eh du ihn haben sollst. Dich sterben laß ich nicht." (Ibid., 128) Dido, shaken by Anna's reproach, decides to protect the city of Carthage. Once she discovers, however, that Hiarbas wants her and not Carthage, she resolves to kill herself, assuring herself that her city would no longer be in danger.

5. Dido's suicide

Dido's inner sickness has now become very evident. Her friends and subjects are most concerned for her mental state and in Act V we see Barce not allowing Dido out of her sight because she is suspicious of the queen's promise of peace for Carthage. Indeed, she implores her queen not to kill herself; Barce wants peace too but not at the expense of Dido's life. Charlotte von Wymetal maintains here that, with Dido's spiritual collapse, Schlegel has reached a danger-point in his

characterization; for to let her suicide result from motives of bitterness, shame and despair would immediately stamp the queen as an unreasoning and undignified woman, and as such she is unfit for the role of the tragic heroine. It is at this crucial moment, she further maintains, that the Hiarbas plot becomes important. Her city is in danger and, in the hour of need, Dido forgets her own personal grief in order to stand by her subjects.[56] It is true that Schlegel introduces the Hiarbas plot to give a public significance to Dido's private decisions, but to maintain that it does not become important until the queen's mind has so clearly become deranged seems somewhat erroneous. It hardly seems feasible, in light of what Johann Heinrich Schlegel tells us in the "Vorbericht" to the edition of his brother's works, that Schlegel uses the Hiarbas plot at this late stage in the play to make Dido forget her own personal grief and stand by her subjects; for the major revision of the first version of Dido made by the dramatist was to add the part, in Act V, about Aeneas' conquest of Hiarbas before taking leave of Carthage. (Werke I, 71) This he did in order to correct the erroneous impression of Aeneas selfishly leaving Dido because he no longer loved her. Schlegel therefore uses the Hiarbas plot here to safeguard Aeneas' integrity as a man of reason by giving him the opportunity to protect his former lover. Moreover, the dramatist introduces the Hiarbas plot to intensify the force of passion in Dido in comparison with the stability of reason in Aeneas, first by emphasizing the attraction that the queen's noble person holds for Hiarbas, and second, by the dementia that her emotions cause in her mind as a result of the news of the imminent invasion by Hiarbas. Wymetal then postulates that in the final act we see a serene woman; the once irrational and

---

[56] Wymetal, op. cit., p. 159.

highly emotional female has now become a dignified queen, keenly aware of her duty to her subjects. Her despair has ostensibly been replaced by a realistic acceptance of the situation and, as such, her character begins to take on heroic proportions. Moreover, Wymetal adds, the situation enables Dido to carry out her duty, whilst at the same time presenting her with the opportunity to find solace from her grief.[57]

It is difficult to see how Dido suddenly becomes rational and serene, keenly aware of her regal duty, when one analyses the text of Act V closely. Indeed, her behaviour can hardly be described as rational or composed:

> Warum verfolgst du mich und bleibst mir stets zur Seite?...
> Ihr Zimmer! die ihr ihn mit Lust bewirthet habt,...
> Ihr habt mir dieses Schwerd, das ihm die Eil verstecket,
> Dies Schwerd, das er vergaß, als einen Schatz, entdecket.
> Dies soll mir ein Geschenk, ein Gegengift der Pein,
> Ein Mittel meiner Ruh und meines Friedens seyn. (Act V, 1; Werke I, 129)

she says to Barce, who is most concerned about Dido's mind. She even tells Barce at one point to refrain from following her like a shadow and to allow her the consolation of solitude. Barce, however, takes no heed of this admonition for she fears for the queen's life; she has misgivings about Dido's promise of peace for Carthage, suspecting that the thirst for revenge still rages within the heroine:

> Ich fürchte dieser Ruh betrügerischen Schein,
> Gewiß giebt dir der Schmerz dies Friedensmittel ein!
> Verzweiflung treibt dich an, dich selber zu verderben.
> (Act V, 1; Werke I, 130)

Her suspicions are not in any sense allayed when Dido implores her to allow her what amounts to the consolation of death:

---

[57] Wymetal, op. cit.

Die Feinde selbst, mein Rath, mein Volk, die Schwester, du,
Ihr alle sollt zugleich die Mittel meiner Ruh,
Die Mittel meines Trosts und meiner Rache hören,
Die meine Brust beschließt, und niemand soll verwehren.
(Act V, 1; Werke I, 131)

Dido does, however, experience the apparent calmness of a suicide victim whose mind is firmly made up; for, once the decision to kill himself has been taken, such a person often experiences an outward appearance of calm and rationality. This is a defence mechanism that enables him to grasp the courage to commit a deed from which, in his right mind, he would otherwise shrink:

Ja, ja, der tapfre Schluß bleibt ungestört und fest,
Der alles, was ich will, auf einmal hoffen läßt
Die Seele wankt nicht mehr mit ungewissem Willen,
Mein Geist sieht seinen Zweck, und eilt, ihn zu erfüllen,
Der Schmerzen wilder Sturm, der Thränen milder Lauf,
Haß, Liebe, Rachgier, Wuth und alles höret auf.
Die Stille meines Geistes bezeuget meinem Herzen,
Daß mich Vernunft regiert, nicht Unruh oder Schmerzen.
(Act V, 1; Werke I, 131)

In saying this, has Dido suddenly become rational and serene, as Wymetal would have us believe?[58] - far from it, for even if everything does seem meaningless to a rational person, he would still cling to life itself as the only thing that he can know! If Dido were subject to the powers of reason, therefore, she would probably not have committed suicide. Furthermore, she would have realised that her suicide was not necessary to save the city of Carthage; for Hiarbas wanted her and not the city, so that she could have saved the life and livelihood of her subjects by merely giving herself to Hiarbas; that would have been the rational way out, that would have given her a stoic victory for reason over her passions. Even more

---

[58] Wymetal, op. cit.

remarkable is the fact that Dido does not wait until she knows without any doubt that Aeneas has deserted her; the rational thinking person considers every possibility, but Dido is here considering committing suicide even before she receives the intimation that Aeneas has departed from Carthage. It is ironic, therefore, that this critic finds Dido to be rational in her thinking just before her death for Schlegel clearly portrays her act of suicide as resulting not from her following the logic of reason but rather from the dictates of her passions. It is quite probable that Wymetal is fashioning her interpretation of Dido not so much on the actual text as on her knowledge of the predisposition of the Enlightenment, conditioned by the influence of Roman thought and tragedy, to regard suicide as an acceptable and even rational way out of a tragic predicament in drama, because it is the result of unavoidable human weaknesses.

Gottsched's Der sterbende Cato (1730) had set the tone for this predisposition. Cato, an elderly Roman patriot, sets virtue and republican ideals above every consideration. He therefore regards Caesar, against whose forces he is making a last ditch stand in Utica, as nothing more than a tyrant and a dictator. A tempting possibility of much-needed military support is opened up to Cato when he discovers that the Parthian princess staying with him is none other than his long-lost daughter Porcia. As heiress to the Parthian throne, she could order the military forces of that country to come to Cato's assistance; but Cato is too much a man of virtue and Roman ideals to take advantage of that. He firmly believes that his virtue will rescue him and his supporters from danger. Virtue does indeed protect him from Pharnaces, by far the most villainous character in the play, for he is rendered powerless in the face of virtue.

When he attacks Utica in order to steal Arsene-Porcia, whom he desperately wants to marry, Pharnaces is killed in the attempt.

A more subtle danger to Cato's virtue lies in the attraction that Caesar holds for his children. His son, Porcius, only feels kindly disposed towards him, but Arsene-Porcia is deeply in love with Caesar. Distinct advantages would accrue to Cato if he condoned his children's feelings and shared them: an honourable cessation of hostilities, a brilliant marriage for Arsene-Porcia, and the preservation of his own civic prestige, for Caesar is willing to divide the 'mayoralty' of Rome with him. But Cato, true to his republican ideals, successfully preserves his family's virtue by persuading Porcius and Arsene-Porcia to swear an undying hatred for Caesar.

At the end of Act IV Cato stands victorious and his confidence in virtue is vindicated. Pharnaces is dead, Caesar is unmasked and his children are secured in their virtue. But the greatest danger of all, the imminent battle with Caesar's forces, still threatens. In fact, the attacking army is so far superior in numbers that Cato advises against resistance. This decision, however, is the start of his departure from virtue.

At the beginning of Act V Cato is all alone reading Plato and ruminating on the question of whether virtue is rewarded or not. He becomes despondent, feeling that the tests sent by Providence to prove his virtue have finally become too much for him and he decides to commit suicide. Because he has done no wrong in his life, Cato thinks that he can face death without fear:

> Wen sein Gewissen plagt, dem stört die Angst den Schlummer:
> Davon weiß Cato nichts. Kein Laster macht mir Kummer!

Drum gilt auch in der Tat mir Schlaf und Tod gleichviel:
Denn beides labet mich und setzt dem Gram ein Ziel.[59]

This would be a fine rational attitude towards an inevitable death but not towards suicide. Cato cannot therefore be using his reason correctly. And the very act of suicide was completely out of harmony with the philosophy of the Age of Rationalism, because it was tantamount to admitting a lack of faith in a benevolent Providence ruling over a rational universe and evidence that one's emotions had run away with reason.[60] As a consequence, Gottsched goes to great lengths in the preface to the play to point out that Cato's guilt is contained in the unavoidable human weaknesses to which every virtuous person is subject:

Endlich muß niemand denken, als wenn die Absicht dieses Trauerspieles diese wäre, den Cato als ein vollkommenes Tugendmuster anzupreisen, nein, den Selbstmord wollen wir niemals entschuldigen, geschweige denn loben. Aber eben dadurch ist Cato ein regelmässiger Held zur Tragödie geworden, daß er sehr tugendhaft gewesen, doch so wie es Menschen zu sein pflegen; daß sie nemlich noch allezeit gewisse Fehler an sich haben, die sie unglücklich machen können. So will Aristoteles, daß man die tragischen Hauptpersonen bilden soll. Durch seine Tugend erwirbt sich Cato unter den Zuschauern Freunde. Man bewundert, man liebet und ehret ihn: Man wünscht ihm daher auch einen glücklichen Ausgang seiner Sachen. Allein, er treibet seine Liebe zur Freiheit zu hoch, so daß sie sich in einen Eigensinn verwandelt. Dazu kommt eine stoische Meinung von dem erlaubten Selbstmord. Und also begeht er einen Fehler, wird unglücklich und stirbt.[61]

Accordingly, if Cato had had more patience and trust, the cause of virtue might well have triumphed over evil. Unfortunately, Cato's love of freedom has become less of a rational conclusion and more of an emotional resolution never to bear the outward signs of servitude, and therein lies

---

[59]Gottsched, Johann Christoph, Der sterbende Cato (Stuttgart, 1966) Act V, 1, p. 76.

[60]Heitner, op. cit., p. 30.

[61]"Vorrede," Cato, p. 17.

his departure from virtue, his tragic guilt, as far as Gottsched is concerned. It is, however, a weakness that can assail any virtuous character.

Once he has established that Cato is guilty, albeit on very tenuous grounds, Gottsched then allows him to commit suicide, not in despair, but in a rational, virtuous frame of mind:

> ...Ihr Götter! hab ich hier
> Vielleicht zu viel getan: Ach! So vergebt es mir!
> Ihr kennt ja unser Herz und prüfet die Gedanken!
> Der Beste kann ja leicht vom Tugendpfade wanken.[62]

Dido, however, is not rational as her death-wish nears its realization; on the contrary, she deludes herself into believing that reason is in control, when she is in actual fact following the dictates of her passion. This is the ultimate revelation of her passion in its most subtle form - under the cloak of rationality - for in this way it achieves its desire. Furthermore, it has an authentic ring when she says that her hatred, love, her thirst for revenge and her very passions have ended; for, because of the finality of her decision to commit suicide, she already considers herself dead - so great is her delusion! It is in that state and that state alone that her passions and her pain cease and reason can once again become a viable entity, at least for those she has left behind. In this Schlegel is evidencing another modern aspect in his dramatization, for in displaying a congruence between concept and reality, between thought and action in the dementedness of the heroine, he anticipates Büchner's Woyzeck, where the uneducated social outcast, bordering on insanity, is the one character without any shade of hypocrisy.

---

[62] Act V, 8; Ibid., p. 84.

In the third from last scene of the play Bitias arrives with the news that the citizens of Carthage are fighting off the barbarian army. Dido is distressed by this, for she is sick of war and fighting - she is a despondent woman:

> Der Seelen innrer Kampf, damit ich mich ermüde,
> Der mir entrißne Tod, der mir versagte Friede,
> So viel verlorne Müh, so viel erlittne Quaal
> Und was uns allem folgt, bedrängt mich auf einmal. (Act V, 2; Werke I, 133)

She feels hemmed in on all sides by pressures. If Hiarbas wants her and not Carthage, then she will escape through suicide for the sake of her subjects and her own peace of mind:

> Hiarbas suchet mich, mich wünscht er zu umfassen:
> Wohlan! Wenn ich entflohn, wird er die Meinen lassen.
> Laß sehen, ob er wahr, ob falsch geredet hat?
> Laß sehn, was er begehrt, mich oder meine Stadt? (Act V, 2; Werke I, 134)

Dido then departs, intent on committing suicide in the delusion that she can avenge herself on her enemies, Aeneas and Hiarbas, "mit andern Waffen" (Ibid.) - by haunting them with her ghost. Nowhere is there a trace of the serene, sacrificial duty as Wymetal maintains,[63] for Dido has found an expedient loophole in Hiarbas' approach - if, as he maintains, he wants her and not Carthage, then he will leave her citizens in peace if she is not there. Moreover, there is nowhere a hint in the text of Act V Wymetal's presumption that Dido first promises herself to Hiarbas before killing herself - for she has discovered a means whereby she can give full vent to her passions and also, as a by-product, protect her citizens. However, there is no doubt from the text of Dido's last speech (Act V, 2; Werke I, 134) that the protection of her citizens is of secondary concern,

---

[63] Wymetal, op. cit., 159ff.

and only that because of the previous implorings of Anna - Dido's one aim is the fulfilment of her desire for revenge!

Anna brings too late the news that Aeneas has returned to defeat Hiarbas and defend Dido, for the queen has already pierced herself with Aeneas' sword. Dido's forceful passionate nature has had its way and it is this that also has the final say:

> Aeneas, fürchte dich! erzittre, falsche Seele! -
> Ich flieh in meine Gruft, doch nur, daß ich dich quäle -
> Verräther!... (Act V, 4; Werke I, 136)

This cancerous passion has achieved the ultimate delusion of Dido's mind.

Gottsched's Cato died with a rational belief in Providence uppermost in his mind; Schlegel's Dido, however, died with impassioned words of vengeance and defiance upon her lips. Cato died virtuous, but Dido died with resentment very much present in her spirit. In Gottsched's play, but for the lack of trust and patience of Cato, virtue would have triumphed; in Schlegel's play it is inevitable that reason will be submerged by passion. As such, Schlegel's portrayal of suicide in Dido is far more convincing that Gottsched's in Cato, since Dido's death comes as a climax to an ever-increasing process of disintegration. In so doing, Schlegel has, perhaps, advanced half-way towards the portrayal of suicide by the Storm and Stress dramatists, where their attention and emphasis focused more on the feelings and emotions of the characters. Whether Schlegel deliberately departed from the Rationalist tradition as exemplified in Gottsched and Cato's suicide, or whether this progressive change was merely intuitive on his part, is difficult to determine. It would appear feasible that Schlegel's portrayal of Dido's suicide was influenced much more by his

original sources, i.e., Vergil's Aeneid and Le Franc de Pompignan's Didon, than by any conscious decision on his part to move away from the virtuous, rational suicide of Gottsched's Cato. On the other hand, however, no-one knows the real reasons for which Schlegel chose the Dido theme and the sources on which he based his drama. It could be that he chose such a theme with the calculated intention of portraying suicide in a manner different from Gottsched, just as a deliberate but subtle distinction comes through in his theory of imitation. There is, however, nothing to substantiate such conjecture. Suffice it to say that Dido's suicide anticipates many aspects that the Storm and Stress writers were later to include in their dramatic attempts at depicting suicide.

Schlegel's portrayal of Dido's disintegration and her ultimate suicide is indeed extremely complex. Only a superficial interpretation can make any claim to Dido's rationality prior to her death, for such an interpretation fails to come to grips with the question of why Dido actually commits suicide before she knows that Aeneas has departed. It is in Act V, scene 3, that Anna brings the news that Aeneas has defeated Hiarbas and then departed from Carthage; but Dido's resolution to kill herself becomes final in Act V, scene 2. Indeed, it is during the course of scene 3, when Anna is bringing the news of Aeneas' victory over Hiarbas, that Dido overpowers Barce off stage and inflicts the mortal blow. In a most ironic way, therefore, the news that the city of Carthage has been saved, which should militate against Dido's suicide as a sacrificial death, is rendered powerless to prevent it. Why then does Schlegel allow Dido to commit suicide before she knows that Aeneas has left Carthage? It could not be to save Carthage from the threat of Hiarbas, for the city is already out of danger; it would only need a moment's patience and

rational reflection on Dido's part to realise this. But that is how close the distinction often is between rational and irrational behaviour. Schlegel's use of dramatic irony at this point in the play leaves no room for interpreting Dido's final behaviour as rational; for rational behaviour would have led the queen to probe into the whereabouts of Aeneas. Dido commits suicide because she is completely a child of her own passions, and her grief at losing her love, which would only be increased by the news that Anna brings, demands the consolation of death. Had she stayed to listen to Anna, she would have heard that there was no need of a sacrificial death. This would not have altered her intended behaviour, however; as she had herself half expected Aeneas to defend her before leaving, Dido had no reason to listen to Anna's news. No, more important to Dido is to take full advantage of the one moment in Act V when most of her close subjects are intent on hearing about the safety of their city; she can then overpower Barce and kill herself before they can disturb her.

Dido demands death for another reason other than consolation from her grief: she wants to pursue her revenge on Aeneas by haunting him with her ghost. This strange belief on Dido's part leads us to question the queen's attitude towards the gods; for if she believes in the possibility of spirits haunting people either as a punishment or as a means of revenge, then why does she flagrantly refuse to accept the authority of the gods when Aeneas reveals their command? Does Dido believe in the gods or does she consider them a figment of Aeneas' imagination? She is convinced that she saw the ghost of Sichäus, her late husband, earlier in the play, and she is equally convinced that her ghost will afford the same treatment to Aeneas for his treachery. It could be that Dido perceives Sichäus' ghost as sent to haunt her by the gods as a punishment

for her misdeed, and therefore she believes that they will punish Aeneas in the same way; this could be what she is expressing when she says to Aeneas in Act II, scene 4: "Dein Schutz, dein Jupiter, ist mehr geschimpft, als ich,/Der strafe, wo er will, und räche sich und mich!" (Werke I, 96-97) On the other hand, this could be an expression of scorn directed at Aeneas and his gods. One thing is clear, however; in practice, Dido does not render allegiance to the gods, for she refuses to acquiesce to their command. And yet she is not taken aback at the mention of the gods, she even knows enough about them to state that they have the power to judge, to punish and to reward. Consequently, we must conclude that Dido only believes in the gods and their supernatural powers when it is in keeping with her own passions. That is to say that, as the play advances and Dido's mind becomes more and more disintegrated, as her passions become more and more arbitrary, so her belief in the gods diminishes. In the final analysis, therefore, Dido's vision of her late husband's ghost and her belief in her supernatural being haunting Aeneas once she is dead, stem not from a rational belief in the gods, for her mind has long since ceased to reason, but from her passions. Her hallucinations and belief in herself as a means of causing hallucinations in Aeneas are the workings of the deranged mind of a rejected lover - she is completely a child of her own emotions.

In one sense, however, Dido's suicide did turn out to be a deed which carried immense political significance for the citizens of Carthage and which therefore appeared sacrificial; her private decisions and actions did take on a public significance. But this was not the major purpose of the final act, nor indeed of the whole tragedy. In the final analysis, Schlegel has portrayed the devastating effects of unrestrained passion in

the protagonist of a tragedy - such a portrayal was made possible by use of the tragic heroine simply because, at the beginning of the eighteenth century, it was generally held that a female was more prone to extreme changes in character and temperament than a man. The important point is that Dido never thought of committing a heroic, sacrificial deed for its own sake; she merely followed the dictates of her passionate nature and the suicide which resulted took on heroic proportions in the eyes of her citizens, for her death in itself would not have saved Carthage. As it was, the city was finally saved by the intervention of Aeneas who was inspired to such a deed by the memory of his love for Dido. Essentially, it was Dido, therefore, and not Aeneas who saved Carthage; but, for her, any such heroic act was an after-thought, as it were, of the deeds dictated by her passion. In this way Schlegel was subtly pointing out to the eighteenth century audience that a passionate female can become a true heroine.

Although Schlegel emphasises the character of Dido in a similar manner to Vergil, his actual characterization of the heroine does differ in its essence.[64] Vergil's work portrayed the destruction of Dido as the result of the gods' arbitrary whim; his characterization is more a study of the psychological effect of this on the heroine herself. Schlegel's work, on the other hand, shows certain influences of the Enlightenment; his characterization of the heroine, like the age in which it was written, is more "empirisch-rationalistisch."[65] Schlegel's Dido suffers her tragedy not so much because of the gods but because of herself, because she gives herself unrestrainedly to the dictates of her

---

[64] Bülnemann, op. cit., p. 90.

[65] Semrau, op. cit., p. 53.

passion. Consequently, her passion becomes arbitrary and absolute and she often loses the ability to have an objective appreciation of her situation. Her struggle with Aeneas is essentially a conflict between passion and reason; true to the age of the Enlightenment, reason triumphs and passion is doomed.

Anna sums up the fate of Dido:

> Der Geist entreißt sich ihr und eilt mit Seufzen fort.
> Das große Herz ist kalt, das nie mit Furcht gerungen;
> Durch seine Neigungen ist es allein bezwungen! (Act V, 4; Werke I, 136)

The moral of the play comes ringing through: "Beware of unbridled passions, for they can destroy the noblest of souls."[66]

It is much to Schlegel's credit that, beginning with his heroine already at something of a peak of doubt and despair, he has managed to produce some development, to go somewhere with the character by use of mental disintegration and hallucination at the end. Yet the most significantly modern aspect of Schlegel's characterization of Dido manifests itself strongly as the heroine's mind begins to disintegrate; Aeneas becomes a mere "object" of her passion, she appears to have lost all touch with him as a real person. A curious aspect of this is her reiterated accusation of his "Undank," alongside her implication that she really wants him, not his gratitude or assistance: "Ich mag die Hilfe nicht, die mir ein Falscher beut.../Sein Beystand nützt mir nichts; sein Abschied wird mich tödten." (Act III, 2; Werke I, 103-104) In this element, where Dido appears to have lost touch with Aeneas as a real person, in her dementedness and in her rage, Schlegel has added new dimensions to what is contained in the original material, the grief of

---

[66] Heitner, op. cit., p. 93.

a woman abandoned. For Dido is, in the end, not merely a rejected woman but one who is completely broken by her own situation and inner condition; within that state of brokenness she becomes totally alienated from her love, her lover, her subjects and herself. Further, Aeneas is alienated from her by her uncontrolled outbursts. Thus the play contains more than just the straightforward rationalist message quoted from Heitner above; underlying the whole play is Schlegel's intimation: beware of unbridled passions, for they can alienate even the noblest of souls. This re-creation of the original material, in the form of an additional dimension, is the first evidence in dramatic practice of Schlegel's breaking with the Gottschedian theory of imitation. It stamps him as a dramatist capable of better theory and more effective practice. But more than that, the very nature of the additional dimension, the theme of alienation, i.e. in the psychological sense, not as a dramatic technique, is an aspect that anticipates the works of Büchner and Wedekind, one and two centuries later. To the rationalist, Dido's suffering and death are the inevitable end for her unrestrained giving of herself to her passions. True as that may be, it must not detract from the more profound and singularly modern aspect that Schlegel is very subtly intimating: that uncontrolled passions lead to alienation - a living death and destruction.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Aeneas: Der Himmel will, Achat, und ich geb ihm Gehör.
Die Ehre winkt: wohlan! Aeneas liebt nicht mehr.
(Act I, 1; Werke I, 77)

Anna of Dido: Das große Herz ist kalt, das nie mit Furcht gerungen;
Durch seine Neigungen ist es allein bezwungen.
(Act V, 4; Werke I, 136)

The play begins with Aeneas' rationalistic words; it ends with Anna's description of Dido's unrestrained passions. At the beginning we see a rational attitude of submission on the part of Aeneas;[1] at the end we observe the very opposite reaction in Dido. Schlegel's Dido breaks with the conventions of the rationalistic age in which it was written; in the heroine we see the protest that love is an emotion that cannot be

---

[1]Aeneas words remind one of the uncompromising trust in rational thought - "Gelassenheit" - of Gellert's Die Schwedische Gräfin. The heroine of this work embodies the ideal of "Gelassenheit:" passions and personal choices she calmly subordinates to the dictates of Providence. Forced to flee from court by the advances of a prince who contrives the disgrace and, seemingly, the death of her husband, the countess finds refuge in Holland and marries a commoner, Herr R., the life-long friend of her husband. After an interval of years the Count returns from Siberian captivity and the original marriage is re-established; the home is shared, however, not only with Herr R. but also with Karoline, a former mistress of the count. The situation of these characters, which may strike the modern reader as absurd, is designed to demonstrate the nature of well-tempered love which adjusts itself rationally to providential changes in circumstance. The destructive power of unbridled passion is illustrated in the sub-plot involving Karlson, Karoline's son by the count: this unfortunate youth marries a girl not according to the dictates of reason but of passion and she subsequently turns out to be his sister. Unable to revert to a proper fraternal relationship, Karlson enlists in the army, hoping to find death. He dies indeed, not in battle, but from a lingering sickness. His sister/widow marries his friend Dormund, only to discover that the latter had poisoned Karlson in order to gain her hand; in despair, she kills herself. Gellert is obviously on the side of the "Gräfin" and her rational approach; Schlegel, on the other hand leans more in favour of Dido and the fullblooded expression of her passionate nature.

controlled by reason. Indeed, the reasoning process in Dido is controlled by her emotional being. She is such a contrast to Aeneas who represents the rational being. For with Dido everything revolves around "das große Herz" - she is a person who possesses a great spirit; whereas with Aeneas everything revolves around "der Himmel" - its wants and commands have completely submerged Aeneas' spirit, nowhere is he described as a great person in Schlegel's work. When "der Himmel will," Aeneas suddenly switches off his love for Dido, for obedience to the gods is his uppermost concern. Only when "das große Herze ist kalt" can Dido's affections and emotions not be expressed. Aeneas feels obliged to listen to the gods' command; Dido's great spirit has never known fear. It is the honour of obedience that overcomes Aeneas' desire to love; Dido's love is only ever conquered by the inclinations and passions of her own heart. Aeneas' motivation is external; Dido's is internal. In the final analysis, both Aeneas and Dido stop loving; to Aeneas it is an externally imposed change, but to Dido the destructive change comes from within.[2]

During the course of this contract between Aeneas and Dido, Schlegel brings out a most significant point. Although Aeneas, the rationalist, is ostensibly the exemplary character for the reader of the Enlighterment, he is often not sure of how he should respond to the gods' command. Dido, on the other hand, at times quite irrational, is never given to doubts as

---

[2]Could there not be some parallel here with the 20th century works of Frisch and Dürrermatt, e.g., Stiller, Andorra, Der Besuch der alten Dame etc., where there is a leaning towards evidencing the modern psychological tenet that the individual person can be most effectively destroyed from within rather than from without.

to what the outcome must be. For her the situation is quite clear, whereas confusion in the mind of Aeneas causes him to vacillate when he should act. Rational thought in Aeneas generally leads to an indecisive passivity, whereas intuitive thought in Dido, governed so tyrannically by her passions, often gives the heroine insight into the real state of affairs. This comes out very clearly when she first arrives on stage, quizzing Achat about her lover, Aeneas:

> Was hat er, wenn ihr nicht Betrug im Herzen traget,
> Erst diesen Augenblick zum Bitias gesaget?
> Was rühmt er meine Huld? So rühmet kein Gemahl!
> Was spricht er nun als Gast, wo er als Herr befahl?
> Was wird so manches Wort von Schuld und Dank verloren?
> (Act I, 4; Werke I, 84)

Dido does not beat around the bush - she comes straight to the point! And in doing so she reads well between the lines; her intuition is right about Aeneas, and yet she has not discovered this through rational thought! Anna so often throughout the drama attempts to rationalize the situation in order to calm Dido's troubled mind; yet in the final analysis, Anna's estimation of the situation falls so much short of the queen's. In spite of her passions, or maybe because of them, Dido is always aware of the implications of Aeneas' behaviour. This aspect of Schlegel's Dido represents a subtle yet enormous divergence from the accepted norm of the Rationalist Age, evidencing that, in his dramatic practice as well as his theory, Schlegel is prepared to differ, albeit unobtrusively, from his teacher, Gottsched.

Dido's sister, Anna, is an early spokesman for a concept of love that would achieve prominence in tragedy some twenty years later, namely that it is an emotion exempt from the control of reason. She

expresses certain views,[3] heretical for the rationalist age, about the validity of vows, particularly vows of chastity sworn under the influence of grief:

> Dein Schwur? der dir im Schmerz und unbedacht entfuhr?
> Vergebens denkt ein Mensch, die Triebe zu verschwören,
> Die die Natur entflammt, und unsre Sinnen nähren.
> (Act II, 3; Werke I, 93)

On account of this temporary reassurance from Anna, Dido is able to justify her position to herself and then reject Aeneas' argument that he is only obeying the will of the gods. She attributes his decision to a coldness of heart and claims that the gods are not involved:

> Was fragt dein steinern Herz nach eines Weibes Thränen?
> Du lachest, wenn ich dich mit Seufzen muß erwähnen. -
> Herz, das kein Mitleid fühlt! Unbändige Tigerzucht!
> ...
> Dein Schutz, dein Jupiter, ist mehr geschimpft, als ich,
> Der strafe, wo er will, und räche sich und mich!
> (Act II, 4; Werke I, 96-97)

Such scornful utterances are out of keeping with the rationalistic age; this becomes even more apparent in her speech to Aeneas when she contemplates killing him and then herself:

> Wie freudig würde dann mein trübes Auge sehn,
> Wie dir der Geist entflöh, da dir dein Recht geschehn!
> O Anblick! Wenn sodann mit meines Blutes Strömen,
> Die Ströme deines Blutes sich zu vermischen kämen!
> (Act II, 4; Werke I, 96)

The overheatedness of words like these is not in harmony with the rational idea of calm and decorum, and before long it becomes the vogue to allow every "Machtweib" and deserted woman in tragedy, e.g., Marwood

---

[3] Heitner, R., German Tragedy in the Age of the Enlightenment (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963), p. 92.

in Miss Sara Sampson, Gräfin Orsina in Emilia Galotti and Isabella in Klinger's Simsone Grisaldo, to utter such a passionate speech.

It is significant that two minor characters in Dido introduce motifs which were to be repeated time and again in subsequent tragedies.[4] Ascan, the son of Aeneas, is the first youth who states that an elder person has taught him to despise the so-called glories of kingship:

> Mein Vater lehrte mich die Kronen längst verachten,
> Die mich durch andrer Schmerz und Seufzer mächtig machten:
> Und mich vergnügt sein Glück weit mehr, als jeder Thron.
> (Act III, 1; Werke I, 103)

Hiarbas, the king of Lybia, is the first person to assert that virtue is more likely to be found among rude people rather than among the highly civilized:

> Doch was [illegible]r Barbarey in unsern Sitten nennt,
> Ist ein gesetzter Muth, der keine Wollust kennt.
> Kein Schatz erweckt uns Neid. Wir brauchen unsre Waffen,
> Nur uns zur Kost ein Wild, im Streite Recht, zu schaffen.
> (Act III, 4; Werke I, 108)

In the short-term this represents quite a change from Schlegel's attitude towards the barbarian Thoas and is a preparation for his favourable and nationalistic attitude towards the barbarous Germans of Hermann.

Schlegel was writing in an era when drama was very circumscribed by Gottschedian conventions. The use of the alexandrine metre was a strong element of these conventions and in many plays, Schlegel's Dido notwithstanding, this has killed the performance value for the modern stage. In most dramas of the time written in alexandrines, one is most conscious of the inevitable rhyme at the end of each line. In Schlegel's

---

[4] Heitner, op. cit., p. 94.

Dido, however, it is different. The rhyme is still there but seems to have been subjugated to the meaning of the line.

> Man hat das Gefühl, daß hier nicht ein vorgelegtes Schema getreulich mit Wörtern gefüllt wird, sondern meint, eine Sprache zu hören, welche sich den Regeln von Metrum, Zeile und Reim zwar noch fügt, aber nicht mehr wesensmäßig durch sie besteht.[5]

Indeed, the external form has become a hindrance to the effectiveness of the language, for the flow of Dido's speeches is no longer dependent upon the rhyme but actually jars against it. And this represents an enlivened language which, for the Gottschedian era, was very progressive.

During the rationalistic era, many of the tragic potentialities inherent in the age in which they lived could not be brought to fruition by the leading dramatists as long as conventions dominated their practice. This was particularly true of the members of Gottsched's school, where the formal structures, the invariable use of alexandrines and the elevated language rarely achieved the highest poetic distinction. Indeed, it almost led to the death of tragedy, for the optimistic outlook of the age was a decisive influence. However, a truly tragic concept did emerge from the tenets of Rationalism once it appeared that one cannot make human beings avoid tragic error and involvement through the mere exercise of rational powers. Schlegel, with his play Dido, was one of the first dramatists to realise this in practice, for the heroine was struggling against Fate represented in Aeneas' destiny and no mere rational solution would satisfy the deep yearning and passions in Dido's soul. In this play, the efficacy of mere rational understanding is very subtly denied by Schlegel, for Dido dies with a curse on her lips.

---

[5] Wolf, Peter, Die Draman Johann Elias Schlegels (Zürich, 1964), p. 60.

In this sense, Schlegel not only influenced Lessing but also anticipated much of the Storm and Stress writings; for once Hamann and other Storm and Stress writers had renounced the efficacy of mere rational thought, Oedipus became a symbol for them of man's struggle against Fate: in different ways the tragedies of later writers such as Schiller, Kleist, Büchner, and Grillparzer were based on this awareness.[6] Through his portrayal of Dido's senses and passions as free from intellectual and rational control, Schlegel anticipated first certain female characterizations of Lessing,[7] and then the attitude to feeling of Hamann, Herder and the rest of the Storm and Stress writers.[8]

Further, as Ferdinand Josef Schneider points out, Schlegel evidenced the distinctive attribute of modern tragedy:

> Wenn er [Schlegel] in der "Fortsetzung" seines Erweises [daß die Gottschedianische Secte den Geschmack verderbe] unbewußt über Aristoteles

---

[6] Stahl, E.L., German Literature of the Eighteenth and Nineteenth Centuries (London, 1970), p. 8.

[7] Schlegel's influence on Lessing was even more apparent through his dramatic theory, particularly his Gedanken zur Aufnahme des dänischen Theaters and Vergleichung Shakespeares und Andreas Gryphs. Commenting on Schlegel's recommendation to study English drama in order to get away from the rigid unities, Hermann Hettner writes: "Ist es nicht, als hörten wir Lessing? Wie bedauerlich, daß Schlegel nicht Lessings Mitkämpfer wurde. Schlegel starb bereits 1749, erst 31 Jahre alt." (Hettner, H., Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im achtzehnten Jahrhundert [Braunschweig, 1925], I, 1, p. 321.) Antoniewicz also saw Schlegel as a forerunner of Lessing. (Antoniewicz, Johann von, "Vorwort - Johann Elias Schlegels Aesthetische und Dramatische Schriften," Deutsche Literaturdenkmale Band 26 [Heilbronn, 1887], p. XLIX).

[8] After Dido, Schlegel broke entirely with classical themes and turned to the past of his own people for his dramatic source, and this, together with his Gedanken zur Aufnahme des dänischen Theaters, paved the way for Herder's later call for a national literature - a literature with an authentic German stamp. Further, it was a performance of Schlegel's Hermann in 1766 that convinced Goethe of the need to write a play containing German material, and Götz von Berlichingen was the result. (Antoniewicz, op. cit., p. VII, VIII).

hinausgreifend im Drama die Schuld des Helden mit seiner Katastrophe in ursächlichen Zusammenhang gebracht haben will, wenn er mit andern Worten die tragische Schuld mit dem Untergang des Helden zu einer dramatischen Einheit verknüpfen will, so rührt er tatsächlich schon an dem Hauptunterscheidungsmerkmal zwischen der modernen Tragödie und dem antiken Schicksalsdrama.[9]

In the sense that Dido, the tragic heroine, possesses a character flaw, Schlegel anticipated not only the tragedies of the Storm and Stress period but even those written by Schiller in the Classical Age; for in Wallenstein and Maria Stuart, to quote but two examples, both protagonists are guilty of a flaw in their character which eventually leads to the tragic catastrophe.

Schlegel the tragic theorist and dramatist was greatly appreciated by those who followed him. Nicolai considered Schlegel as "den geschicktesten, dem deutschen Theater eine neue Form zu geben."[10] Lessing praised Schlegel as the one "der dem deutschen Theater die meiste Ehre gemacht hat."[11] Herder, in an introductory review of the fourth volume of Schlegel's works, published in the Allgemeinen deutschen Bibliothek, says of the deceased tragedian:

> Wir urtheilen mit der Unparteilichkeit, die wir der Asche eines so theuren Schriftstellers schuldig sind; wer Schlegel in seinen theatralischen Stücken, in seinen Abhandlungen, in seinen horazischen Briefen zu schätzen weiß: wird es ihm verzeihen, wenn er kein Odendichter, oder kein Anakreontiker von erstem Range ist.[12]

Schiller mentions Schlegel in his famous treatise - Über naive und

---

[9] Schneider, F.J., Die deutsche Dichtung zwischen Barock und Klassizismus (Stuttgart, 1924), p. 111.

[10] Nicolai, F., Briefe über den itzigen Zustand der schönen Wissenschaften in Deutschland (Berlin, 1755), p. 123.

[11] Lessing, G.E., "Hamburgische Dramaturgie - Stück 13,"; Sämtliche Schriften L - M (Stuttgart, 1893), VII, p. 58.

[12] Herder, as quoted by Antoniewicz, op. cit., p. VII.

sentimentalische Dichtung - indeed, his respect for Schlegel as a dramatist was extremely high; he describes him as: "einen der geistreichsten Dichter unseres Vaterlandes, an dessen Genie es nicht lag, daß er nicht unter den ersten dieser Gattung glänzt."[13]

Sadly, no-one has really appreciated Schlegel as the tragedian who wrote Dido. Most of the critics dismiss this play as Gottschedian without further consideration. Moreover, the use of the alexandrine metre has killed its performance value for the modern stage. Yet in spite of these shortcomings, Dido evidences aspects of Schlegel's creativity as a tragedian; for, within the very circumscribed Gottschedian framework, he has produced a drama which, in its display of unbridled passion, anticipates the later Storm and Stress heroes and heroines, and which, in its precipitation of the catastrophe as a result of a flaw in the protagonist, has certain classical undertones. In the final analysis, Schlegel was attempting a drama which the language of the time was incapable of fully expressing; yet his use of language was quite before its time for the rationalist age. Dido may not possess the captivating pull of the later, more popular dramas of Lessing, Goethe and Schiller, but it nevertheless is worthy of more consideration and appreciation than the critics have afforded it in the past. This thesis has been an attempt to redress that imbalance, through close examination of a tragedy that has not received much attention in the secondary literature.

---

[13] Schiller, "Über naive und sentimentalische Dichtung," Sämtliche Werke, Hrsg. von Bellermann (Leipzig und Wien, 1895), VIII, p. 310-407, p. 381.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Schlegel's Works

Schlegel, Johann Elias. Werke. Hrsg. von Johann Heinrich Schlegel, 5 Bde. Kopenhagen und Leipzig, 1761.

_____. Ästhetische und dramaturgische Schriften. Hrsg. von Johann von Antoniewicz. Heilbronn, 1887.

2. Further Original Sources

Aristotle. Aristotle's Poetics. Transl. By S.H. Butcher, 4th ed. New York, 1951.

Gellert, Christian Fürchtegott. Sämtliche Schriften. Berlin, 1776.

Gottsched, Johann Christoph. Versuch einer critischen Dichtkunst. 4. Auflage. Leipzig, 1744.

_____. Die deutsche Schaubühne. 3. Auflage. Leipzig, 1744.

_____. Der sterbende Cato. Stuttgart, 1956.

Horace. Ars Poetica. London, 1776.

Le Franc de Pompignan. Didon. Amsterdam, 1735.

Lessing, Gotthold Ephraim. Sämtliche Schriften. Hrsg. von K. Lachmann und F. Muncker. Stuttgart, 1893.

Nicolai, Friedrich. Briefe über den itzigen Zustand der schönen Wissenschaft in Deutschland. Berlin, 1755.

Schiller, Johann Christoph Friedrich von. Sämtliche Werke. Hrsg. von Bellermann. Leipzig und Wien, 1895.

Vergil. Aeneidos Liber IV. Ed. by B. Tilley. London, 1968.

_____. The Aeneid. Transl. by C.J. Billson. Oxford, 1923.

_____. Aeneas. Übersetzt von W. Plankl. Stuttgart, 1959.

Weisse, Christian Felix. Neue Bibliothek der schönen Wissenschaften, 1770.

Wolff, Christian. Vernünfftige Gedancken von Gott, der Welt und der Seele des Menschen, auch allen Dingen überhaupt. Andrer Teil, 3. Auflage. Frankfurt-am-Main, 1733.

3. General Critical Sources

Danzel, Theodore. Gottsched und seine Zeit. Leipzig, 1848.

Gysi, Klaus. Aufklärung. Berlin, 1966.

Hettner, Hermann. Geschichte der deutschen Literatur im 18. Jahrhundert. Braunschweig, 1925.

Hunger, Hermann. Lexicon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie. Wien, 1969.

Kaiser, Gerhard. Von der Aufklärung bis zum Sturm und Drang. 1730 bis 1789. Gütersloh, 1966.

Köster, Albert. Die Literatur der Aufklärungszeit. Heidelberg, 1925.

Rasch, W. "Die deutsche Literatur der Aufklärungszeit: ein Forschungsbericht." Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte 30 (1956).

Roscher. Ausführliches Lexicon der Griechischen und Römischen Mythologie. Leipzig, 1890-1897.

Schreiber, Sara E. The German Woman in the Age of the Enlightenment. New York, 1948.

Sperber, H. "Die Sprache der Aufklärung." Zeitschrift für deutschen Unterricht 43 (1929).

Stahl, E.L. and Yuill, W.E. German Literature in the 18th and 19th Centuries. London, 1970.

Tripp. Cromwell's Handbook of Classical Mythology. New York, 1970.

Waniek, Gustav. Gottsched und die Literatur seiner Zeit. Leipzig, 1897.

Wiese, Benno von. "Forschungsbericht." Deutsche Vierteljahrsschrift für Literaturwissenschaft und Geistesgeschichte 12 (1934).

4. Critical Sources for Schlegel's Theory and Practice

Antoniewicz, Johann von. "Vorwort." Ästhetische und dramaturgische Schriften. Heilbronn, 1887.

Bünemann, H. Elias Schlegel und Wieland als Bearbeiter antiker Tragödien. Leipzig, 1928.

Creizenach, Wilhelm. "Besprechung von Eugen Wolffs Buch über Schlegel." Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie 22 (1890).

Eaton, J.W. "Johann Elias Schlegel and German Literature." Germanic Review 4 (1929).

Eschenburg, J.J. Beispielsammlung der schönen Wissenschaften. Berlin, 1793.

Heitner, Robert. German Tragedy in the Age of the Enlightenment. Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1963.

Rentsch, J. J.E. Schlegel als Trauerspieldichter. Diss. Erlangen, 1890.

Schmid, C.H. Nekrolog der vornehmsten teutschen Dichter. Erfurt, 1785.

Schneider, Ferdinand Josef. Die deutsche Dichtung zwischen Barock und Klassizismus 1700-1785. Stuttgart, 1924.

Schonder, H. J.E. Schlegel als Übergangsgestalt. Berlin, 1941.

Schum, A. Studien zur deutschen Alexandrinertragödie. Diss. Würzburg, 1919.

Semrau, Eberhard. Dido in der deutschen Dichtung. Berlin und Leipzig, 1930.

Staiger, Emil. "Rasende Weiber in der deutschen Tragödie des 18. Jahrhunderts. Ein Beitrag zum Problem des Stilwandels." Stilwandel. Zürich, 1963.

Wilkinson, Elizabeth. Johann Elias Schlegel as a German Pioneer in Aesthetics. Darmstadt, 1973.

_____. "Some unpublished letters from the correspondence of Johann Elias Schlegel." Modern Language Review XXXIV (1939).

Wolff, Eugen. Johann Elias Schlegel, eine Monographie. Berlin, 1889.

Wolf, Peter. Die Dramen Johann Elias Schlegels. Zürich, 1954.

Wymetal, Charlotte von. "The Hero and his Opponent in the Heroic Tragedy from Gottsched to Lessing." Unpub. Diss. New Haven, 1954.